DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 180 276 HE 011 769

AUTHOR	Perlman, Daniel H.
TITLE	Democracy in the University: A Case Study of Campus-Wide Governance at Roosevelt University.
INSTITUTION	Academy for Educational Development, Inc., Washington, D.C.: Roosevelt Univ., Chicago, Ill.
SPONS AGENCY	Lilly Endowment, Inc., Indianapolis, Ind.
PUB DATE	Feb 76
NOTE	141p.; Not available in paper copy due to light type of original
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Codes of Ethics: *College Administration: *College Governing Councils: College Role: Decision Making: Educational History: Educational Research: Evaluation: *Governance: Higher Education: Income: Needs Assessment: Private Colleges: Resource Allocations: *Urban Universities
IDENTIFIERS	Constitutions (Documents): Outcomes: *Roosevelt University IL

ABSTRACT

A case study of campus-wide governance at Roosevelt University in Chicago, Illinois, is presented that surveys the performance of the University Senate and its several committees during the period from 1966 through 1975 with respect to eight specific governance issues. The eight issues or areas of concern include: clarification of institutional purposes, clarification of programs, clarification of budget priorities, income development, program technology and management, program requirements and outcomes, academic and student behavior, and program evaluation. The phrase "campus-wide governance" is used to refer to those forms and arrangements for institutional decision-making, problem-solving, idea formation, and opinion expression that involve more than one constituency in the institution. Historical background on the university and a discussion of the evolution of campus-wide governance at the university are presented. The operations of the university's campus-wide governance mechanisms in each of the eight areas of concern are examined in detail. Appendices include the Constitution of the Faculty and By-Laws of Roosevelt University, the mission of Roosevelt University, the student code of conduct and the Judicial Review Board composition and procedure, and the Roosevelt University committee list. (SC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED180276

DEMOCRACY IN THE UNIVERSITY:
A CASE STUDY OF CAMPUS-WIDE GOVERNANCE AT ROOSEVELT UNIVERSITY

(Undertaken as Part of a Study of Campus-Wide Governance
Conducted by the Academy for Educational Development
With the Support of the Lilly Endowment, Inc.)

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Daniel H
Perlman
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Daniel H. Perlman

Dean of Administration
Roosevelt University
Chicago, Illinois

February, 1976

HE 011 769

Democracy in the University: A Case Study of Campus-Wide Governance at Roosevelt University

contents

Context of the Case Study 1

Historical Background of Roosevelt University 3

The Evolution of Campus-Wide Governance at Roosevelt University 8

The Roosevelt University Senate 14

Campus-Wide Governance at Roosevelt University in Relation to Eight Problem Areas 19

1. Clarification of Institutional Purposes 19
2. Clarification of Programs 24
3. Clarification of Budget Priorities 28
4. Income Development 35
5. Program Technology and Management 37
6. Program Requirements and Outcomes 38
7. Academic and Student Behavior 41
8. Program Evaluation 47

Summary and Conclusions 49

Appendixes 57

A. Constitution of the Faculty and By Laws of Roosevelt University
B. The Mission of Roosevelt University
C. The Student Code of Conduct and the Judicial Review Board Composition and Procedure
D. Roosevelt University Committee List

Democracy in the University:
A Case Study of Campus-Wide Governance at
Roosevelt University

(Undertaken as Part of a Study of Campus-Wide Governance
Conducted by the Academy for Educational Development
With the Support of the Lilly Endowment, Inc.)

Context of the Case Study

This case study of campus-wide governance at Roosevelt University in Chicago surveys the performance of the University Senate and its several committees, during the period from 1966 through 1975, in relationship to eight specific governance issues. This case study has been prepared as part of a comprehensive evaluation of the effectiveness of campus-wide governance systems in contributing to the resolution of issues which have arisen on American campuses during the past decade. The comprehensive evaluation is being conducted by Dr. John D. Millett of the Academy for Educational Development with the support of the Lilly Endowment, Inc. Dr. Millett's evaluation attempts to examine several hypotheses concerning the governance of colleges and universities from the perspective of thirty representative institutions, each of which is contributing a case study of their experience with campus-wide governance. "Campus-wide governance" is used to refer to those forums and arrangements for institutional decision making, problem solving, idea formulation, and opinion expression which involve more than one constituency in the institution: that is, faculty, students, administrative and professional staff, clerical and office staff, etc.

The focus of the case studies of these thirty selected institutions, of which Roosevelt is one, is an examination of the extent to which campus-wide governing bodies were concerned during the past decade with eight of the fundamental issues or problems associated with college and university governance. These eight issues or areas of concern are:

1) clarification of institutional purposes
2) clarification of programs
3) clarification of budget priorities
4) income development
5) program technology and management
6) program requirements and outcomes
7) academic and student behavior, and
8) program evaluation.

These eight problem areas are explained in more detail in the sub-sections in which the operations of Roosevelt University's campus-wide governance mechanisms in each of these areas are examined.

Dr. Millett advances three alternative hypotheses regarding campus-wide governance.

> One hypothesis is that a campus internally is comprised of various interest groups and that these interest groups struggle for power to impose their goals and their beliefs on other interest groups. . . .
>
> A second hypothesis is that the campus internally represents an organized anarchy whose objective is to keep goals problematic, technology uncertain, and decision making individualistic. . . .
>
> A third hypothesis is that the concept of organizational dualism between faculty affairs and administrative affairs has been maintained over recent years, but communication and interaction between the two sets of activities has been greatly advanced.

Dr. Millett's objective "is to determine which of these hypotheses most nearly is in accordance with the facts of experience."

Historical Background of Roosevelt University

Roosevelt is an independent, non-sectarian, coeducational university located primarily in downtown Chicago and serving the Chicago metropolitan community. Roosevelt has about 7,500 full and part-time students enrolled in five colleges (Arts and Sciences, Business Administration, Music, Education, and Continuing Education) with academic programs through the Master's degree. The average age of these students is 30 years; they attend classes from 8:00 in the morning until 10:30 at night and on Saturdays and Sundays; they are served by a faculty which includes almost equal numbers of full-time and part-time members.

The part-time faculty bring to their classes a wide range of professional experiences and competences augmenting the more traditional academic interests and concerns of the full-time faculty. The students represent a cross-section of the Chicago metropolitan community. Approximately one-third of them are members of minority groups.[1] Typically they attend Roosevelt part-time, between family and job responsibilities. The majority have transferred to Roosevelt after having begun their collegiate work elsewhere: in one of the city's community colleges, in a local state university, or in a college in another part of the country, often many years before. The faculty claim, and studies bear out, that these students represent the full spectrum of academic ability from average to among the brightest they have experienced at any collegiate institution. Roosevelt has a 360 bed dormitory which accommodates out-of-state students and a growing number of foreign students, but over 90 percent of the students are from the Chicago metropolitan area. Most of the students attend the University's main facility, located in downtown Chicago. Three satellite centers, developed in northern suburbs, are attracting an increasing number of suburban residents.

---

[1] As currently defined by the federal government. Well over half are minorities if one uses the more traditional definition that includes other ethnic and religious groups.

Roosevelt University is deeply involved in urban activities of various kinds. Although it overlooks Chicago's Grant Park and lakefront, there is no grassy campus separating it from the rest of the city. The urban experience is part of everyone's curriculum.

Although independent, Roosevelt is, in many ways, a people's university. It was founded with no endowment in April, 1945, at the end of the Second World War, by its first president, Edward J. Sparling, a faculty, and a small, inter-racial board. It was initially to be called Thomas Jefferson College, but the death of FDR prompted its founders to adopt his name.

Roosevelt College evolved from the Central YMCA College of Chicago, one of many YMCA colleges serving working students in the country's major cities. Sparling, who had been president of Central YMCA College, resigned his position in a controversy with his governing board over issues of academic freedom and non-discrimination. That controversy was to be an important determinant in the character of the new institution. Roosevelt College was founded as militantly and unabashedly egalitarian and democratic. As America and her allies would "bring democracy" to Italy, Germany, and Japan, so Roosevelt College would "bring democracy" to American higher education. At a time, nine years before the Supreme Court's Brown decision, when quota systems in admissions, and discrimination in hiring were not uncommon in American higher education, Roosevelt College was avowedly integrationist. At a time before campus-wide governance was a popular model, Roosevelt College established governance mechanisms designed to create of the college a partnership in which everyone who had a stake would be represented.

Most of the faculty of the Central YMCA College, including the dean of faculties, joined with Sparling in resigning from that institution to start the new college. Both he and they saw it as their institution as much as his, and they would participate in its governance. Although most American colleges trace their origins to a public or private Board that hired a president and a faculty, Roosevelt began with a president and faculty that sought out and established a Board.

Classes began in September, 1945, with over 1,300 students, most of whom had been at the predecessor institution, in rather makeshift facilities in downtown Chicago. The faculty had participated in the hasty conversion of an old office building over the summer. They were barely finished in time for registration. Roosevelt College had none of the assets that are traditionally necessary to found a college, except self-confidence and belief in an idea. In some ways it was similar to what in more recent years would have been called a "free university," except that Roosevelt had a traditionally educated faculty offering a traditional curriculum.

Some of the enthusiasm, confidence, and pride of this early period is expressed in a report from the dean of faculties to the Board of Trustees (of which he was himself a member) in December, 1945.

> If it is foolhardy for 68 men to resign their jobs without assurance of future security, the faculty of Roosevelt College was foolhardy.
>
> If it is impossible to remodel an 11-story building in 33 days, equipping it with classrooms, library, laboratories, and offices, Roosevelt College was an impossibility.
>
> If it is absurd for a new college to offer such subjects as advanced calculus, to apply for accreditation six days after the opening of school, and to graduate a class at the end of the first 17 weeks, then Roosevelt College is absurd.
>
> If it is radical to teach future labor leaders, as well as future businessmen, the mysteries of accounting; if it is radical to supply Jews, Poles, Japanese, and Negroes as well as Anglo-Saxons with the tools of language, then Roosevelt College is radical.
>
> If it is impractical to give employed men and women during the evening hours courses of standard quality in history, chemistry, and music, Roosevelt College is impractical.
>
> I am proud to say that Roosevelt College is in these ways foolhardy, impossible, absurd, radical and impractical.[1]

In its second year the College purchased, and in 1947 occupied, the historic Auditorium Building at Congress Street and Michigan Avenue in downtown Chicago. Designed by the famous architects Dankmar Adler and Louis Sullivan and completed in 1889, the Auditorium Building had had a long and distinguished history before its purchase by Roosevelt. A 4,000 seat theater occupying 40 percent of the block-long structure had been the site of national political conventions and the location of performances by such stars as Caruso, Adelina Patti, John Philip Sousa, and Sarah Bernhardt. An elegant hotel enveloped the theater on two sides, and on the third was an office wing. There were also commercial offices in the seven-story tower which rises above the tenth floor and was the highest point in Chicago at the time it was built. Altogether, the Auditorium Building had approximately 650,000 square feet, much of it lined with oak, onyx, marble, mahogany, stained glass, gold leaf and intricately stenciled ornament.

---

[1] Wayne A. R. Leys, "Report to the Board," Minutes of the Roosevelt College Board of Directors, December 17, 1945.

Hotel rooms and commercial offices made excellent classrooms, faculty offices, and laboratories; the grand dining room became a library reading room, book stacks were placed in the old kitchens; and fireplace flues were used to exhaust the chemistry labs. The decision about whether or not to restore the theater took over a decade to resolve and almost split the young institution. Ultimately, the theater was restored as were other public rooms in the building.

The Auditorium Building is listed in the National Register of Historic Places, included in the Historic American Building Survey, designated a Chicago Landmark by one commission and nominated for the same honor by another, and in 1975 was named a National Historic Landmark by the Department of the Interior. The venerable building has been a good home for Roosevelt, and has lent a dignity and tradition that has become a part of the institution.

From the start, Roosevelt's curriculum and administrative structure reflected an urban focus and orientation. In 1946 a Labor Education Division was established to conduct educational programs for labor unions. Subsequently, a Division, later College, of Continuing Education was established to meet the educational needs of adult students. In 1954 the ninety-year-old Chicago Musical College, founded by Florenz Ziegfeld, merged with Roosevelt College; the graduate program, which had been started four years before, was expanded; and the institution's name was changed to Roosevelt University. Until 1971 Roosevelt was entirely a commuter institution. In that year, a student union and dormitory was opened. Numerous changes in curriculum and physical facilities have been made on a routine basis over the years. Some of these changes are discussed below, but most are beyond the scope of this study.

The author of this case study has been an employee of Roosevelt University since 1961. He has held the positions of psychological counselor, assistant to the president, and director of government relations and long-range planning. Currently he holds the positions of dean of administration, secretary of the Board of Trustees, and professor of education. He has regularly attended meetings of the Senate, the Board of Trustees, the Planning Committee, and the Administrative Council since 1965. For this case study minutes of meetings, personal notes, recollections, and conversations with other participants were relied upon.

The Evolution of Campus-Wide Governance at Roosevelt University

Campus-wide participation in the governance of the College was encouraged by its founding president and became an important part of its ethos. Faculty membership on the governing board had been one of Sparling's ideas for the new institution since its inception. He believed that one of the causes of his difficulty with the governing board of the Central YMCA College was the similarity of background and viewpoint of the members of that Board and the divergence of their background from that of the faculty and other constituencies served by the college. Sparling envisaged a Board, broadly representative of the many groups in society, of which a majority would be elected by the faculty from their own number. While sharing Sparling's ideas about democracy and self governance, the faculty were apprehensive about occupying too many positions on the Board which they thought should be concerned primarily with fund raising.

The faculty suggested, and the Board agreed, that faculty-elected trustees represent 25 percent of the Board membership. The establishment of faculty trusteeship at Roosevelt College at its inception has given that institution the most extensive experience with this form of governance of any American university. (In 1916 Cornell became the first American university since the colonial period to have faculty members serve on its governing Board; however, it was not until 1956 that the faculty members of that Board were permitted to vote.)[1]

The specific provisions for faculty participation on the Roosevelt Board and for other aspects of institutional governance were worked out in a series of meetings and lengthy discussions during the Spring, Summer, and Fall of 1945, as a Constitution and By Laws (included as Appendix A) were written, debated, and enacted.[1] There was a revolutionary and utopian attitude towards the new college. The faculty wanted to create governance mechanisms that were as nearly perfect, as democratic and egalitarian, as could be devised. They had resigned secure positions at an established institution in pursuit of an ideal, and they wanted to shape the new institution in accordance with that ideal.

---

[1] For a history of faculty participation on college and university governing boards, and an evaluation of the Roosevelt University experience see Perlman, Daniel H. Faculty Trusteeship in Higher Education (Research report submitted to the U.S. Office of Education), 1971, ERIC Document No. ED 060 824.

In the beginning the faculty met as a body, town meeting style. The Constitution recognized this group as "The Faculty"; it was presided over by an elected chairman rather than by the president. Every full-time member of the faculty, virtually every full-time administrative and professional staff member, and part-time members of both the faculty and the administrative staff with one or more years of service, were members of The Faculty and had the right to vote. Two representatives of the student body, appointed by the Student Senate, were recognized as associate members of The Faculty (with the right to speak but not to vote).

Every aspect of governance was discussed in order to establish the most perfect form. The Hare system of proportional representation (sometimes known as proportional voting) was designated as the method of election for most offices because it was believed that this system gave most adequate representation to minority viewpoints. It was decided that the deans and the president, although appointed by the Board, should be confirmed by a two-thirds vote of the faculty and should submit to a vote of confidence from The Faculty every three years. Department chairmen were elected by the Executive Committee of each school which in turn was composed of elected faculty representatives as well as the school dean, the dean of faculties, and the president. A grievance procedure was established, similar to procedures used in the labor movement and currently found in collective bargaining contracts, giving every full-time employee of the College the right to file a grievance whenever there was a serious difference of opinion with another member of the faculty or staff. The grievance procedure involved appeals at various levels up to the Board of Trustees. A parallel procedure was adopted for the students, should they feel aggrieved by a faculty member or administrator. The concern for constitutional perfection which characterized Roosevelt in 1945 has remained a characteristic of the University. Many hours have been spent debating the details of governance provisions.

---

[1] The Constitution and By Laws specified the president as an ex officio member of the board and stipulated that as many as two, but no more, of the faculty-elected trustees could be full-time members of the administrative staff. Although the number of faculty-elected trustees has been increased over the years (from five to seven), the limitation of no more than two administrators remains. Prior to 1973 at least one of the faculty-elected trustees was an administrative officer; since that time there have been none.

A major change in governance was made in 1948 when a Senate was established to supersede, although not replace, The Faculty. The governing unit of The Faculty was retained to conduct the triennial votes of confidence and to vote on referenda concerning constitutional amendments approved by more than half but less than 70 per cent of the senators, but the primary authority for academic governance was transferred to the Senate. Other changes and refinements in governance were made over the years. By 1966 votes of confirmation for the deans and the president had been abolished; the faculty role on the Board had grown to seven members (although no longer calculated as one-fourth of the Board); the manner of electing the faculty trustees had been revised; and a Budget Committee was established.

The Roosevelt University Budget Committee is an instrument of campus-wide governance as egalitarian as any of its other mechanisms. The Budget Committee was established by the Senate in 1951 after a trial experience with joint budget making the preceeding year. The committee was accepted by the president and the Board. The Budget Committee consisted initially of six faculty members elected by the Senate working jointly with the six administrative officers (the president, the controller, the dean of faculties, and the deans of what were then the institution's three schools: arts and sciences, business, and music[1]) who had previously developed the budget administratively. The twelve-member Budget Committee was chaired by the president, and was regarded as advisory to the Board directly, rather than to the president or the Senate. The committee held itself responsible for the formulation and presentation to the Board of a balanced budget. The president retained for himself the right to submit a minority report, but in practice Budget Committee reports were nearly always unanimous.

The Budget Committee grew out of the faculty's concern for participation in the difficult resource-allocation decisions that had to be made in the period of sharply declining enrollment and declining income which occurred during the early '50s when the G.I. enrollment tapered off and the Korean War draft took effect. The Budget Committee has persisted since that time, and, as might be expected, has become one of the most powerful bodies in the University. It is regarded by some as another instance of the partnership that exists between the various constituencies in the University and by others as a forum for collective bargaining between the faculty and the administration. It is seen by all as one of the basic components of Roosevelt University's system of institutional governance.

---

[1] In 1955 Roosevelt College became Roosevelt University and its component schools became colleges. Subsequently, two other units--education and continuing education--were given collegiate status, although not representation on the Budget Committee. During the period covered by this case study (1966-1975) a change, discussed later, was made in the composition of the Budget Committee reducing its size but maintaining the same ratio between faculty and administration.

Subsequent to the establishment of the Budget Committee other joint committees were established in which two or more of the University's constituent groups were represented; notable among these is the Planning Committee which contains equal numbers of faculty-elected and administratively-appointed members. None of these other bodies has achieved the importance or influence of the Budget Committee, however.

This case study focuses on the decisions made by the Roosevelt University Senate, and to a lesser extent by the Planning and Budget Committees during the decade between 1966 and 1975. By the beginning of this period the basic structures of University governance had been set as they were to remain. The faculty's concern for perfecting these governance forms also remained, and the record of the past decade includes many small changes, attempted changes, and refinements in the procedures of campus governance. These changes and refinements have typically received great debate and attention--as if they would make a fundamental difference in the character or operation of the University. What they reveal, collectively, is a view of the University's governance as perfectable and a belief that with sufficient attention to detail an ideal form can be enacted or safeguarded.

The Roosevelt University Senate

The Roosevelt University Senate is a campus-wide parliamentary body consisting of ex officio, elected regular, and associate members. Currently there are 89 senators: the "ex officio members" are administrative officers mentioned by title in the Constitution;[1] the "elected regular members" include the faculty representatives elected annually by their respective academic departments;[2] one "regular member" is elected by the library staff (other than the head librarian); one "regular member" is elected by "the administrative voting members of The Faculty";[3] another "regular member" is elected by "the administrative associate members of The Faculty";[1] the "associate members" of the Senate are "the associate student members of The Faculty."[2]

---

[1] ". . . The President, the Deans [of which there are currently nine], the Associate Dean of Admissions and Records, the Directors of the non-credit Divisions [one], the Treasurer, the Director of Development, and the Head Librarian . . ."

[2] The Constitution specifies a rather arcane formula for the determination of the number of senators to be elected by a department (See Article III, Section I, Clause 2). Essentially, the number of faculty senators is to bear the same proportion to the total faculty as the number of ex officio administrative senators bears to the total administrative staff. The number of senators allocated to each department is computed annually and may vary from year to year.

[3] The "administrative voting members of The Faculty" are specified by title in the Constitution. They include "those members of the administrative staff whose duties bring them into close contact with student or academic affairs and whose academic qualifications are comparable to those [of the teaching faculty]." The enumeration of individuals to be included in this category is a topic about which there has been frequent debate in the Senate Membership Committee as well as on the floor of the Senate.

The operation of the Roosevelt University Senate is detailed in the Constitution and by years of custom. Meetings are held on the third Wednesday of every month from October to May. They begin at 1:00 p.m. and last ninety minutes. The Constitution specifies that agenda shall be prepared by "the President, in consultation with the Chairman of the University Senate and the Deans" and circulated a week prior to meetings. In practice over the past decade the agenda have been prepared by the chairmen of the Senate and given to the president's secretary for typing and distribution without further change. Members of the faculty and administrative staff who are not senators are welcome to attend Senate meetings. Students who are non-senators have also generally been permitted to attend meetings, although occasionally (if the student delegation is large or boisterous--which it rarely is--or has asked for permission) the Senate may vote on the matter.

Special meetings of the Senate may be called by the president, by the dean of faculties, by the Senate Executive Committee, or upon petition of one-fourth of the membership of the Senate. Special meetings, though rare, have been held two or three times during the past decade, at times of major student dissent. Occasionally, if there is pressing unfinished business remaining at 2:30, the Senate may hold a special meeting prior to the next regularly scheduled session.

---

[1] The "administrative associate members of The Faculty" are defined as "all members of the administrative staff with annual contracts who are not included [in the list of administrative voting members of The Faculty]." Recently there was some debate in the Senate as to the meaning of the term "annual contracts" and whether that was intended to exclude administrators who are on "letters of appointment."

[2] The two student senators are selected by the Student Government.

The first item on the agenda of every Senate meeting, after the approval of Minutes and any special announcements, is a report of the president. The president usually informs the Senate of the recent developments in the institution including relevant actions by the Administrative Council and the Board of Trustees, as well as grant awards and major financial contributions. The president keeps the Senate informed of his professional activities including attendance at meetings and the like. Following his report, the president answers questions (ostensibly on his report--in practice, on virtually any topic) addressed to him by senators.

The second item on the agenda is the report of the faculty members of the Board of Trustees. Although the faculty trustees are given this opportunity to report, they do so only occasionally--in part, perhaps, because the president has usually just reported on the Board's actions.

The agenda then calls for reports from the standing committees: including the Executive, Curriculum, Graduate Council, Budget, Planning, Academic Conference, Student Activities Board, Student Senate, and recently, the Faculty Tenure Review Committee. The Faculty Tenure Review Committee was established by the Senate, under an amendment to the Constitution adopted during the 1974-75 academic year, to serve as a grievance committee to review negative tenure decisions when a faculty member alleges that there was inadequate consideration of his or her credentials or a violation of academic freedom. The Committee was established to parallel the other grievance mechanism provided for in the Constitution, which had theretofore excluded tenure appeals.

The Student Activities Board is a joint student-faculty committee responsible for reviewing various student personnel matters including the budgets recommended for certain student organizations. The Student Activities Board has reported to the Senate since its inception. Early in the past decade the president of the Student Senate requested an opportunity to report regularly to the University Senate. Although there was some debate about it at the time, the item was added to, and remains on the agenda.

While it is technically not a committee of the Senate, the actions of the Academic Conference--a committee of the academic and student personnel deans--are routinely reported by its chairman, the dean of faculties.

Following the reports of these standing committees, and any action that might ensue therefrom, the Senate entertains both old and new business. At the latter point any senator may, when recognized, address any issue, problem, or topic of concern whether or not it had been previously attended to by the Senate or included on the agenda.

The meetings of the Senate are conducted in accordance with the procedures specified in the Constitution and in Roberts' Rules of Order. The meetings have a certain parliamentary formality with the chairman ruling on points-of-order, substitute-motions, amendments-to-the-amendment, motions-to-table, and committees-of-the-whole. The elected chairmen have generally been able to keep track of the often complex substantive and procedural business and have kept the Senate functioning in an orderly and deliberate fashion despite the intense feelings that often arise on issues.

Although the procedures for the conduct of Senate meetings are specified in detail, there is no similar precision in the definition of the Senate's jurisdiction or domain; in fact, there is no definition. For the most part, however, this doesn't seem to bother anyone. The Senate acts without challenge on curricular and academic matters that affect more than one college, it acts on constitutional issues that relate to the procedures by which the University is governed, and it acts on matters arising from the various committees. Amendments to the Constitution passed by the Senate must be ratified by the Board, but on most other matters, the Senate's decision is binding. Occasionally the Senate will take action on matters which are recognized as clearly outside of its formal domain of responsibility, in which case the Senate action is understood as advisory to the appropriate administrator. An example of this occurence was the recent (December, 1975) vote requesting the Fringe Benefit Committee[1] to convene and consider the extension of certain fringe benefits to the heirs of deceased faculty--a matter on which the Senate can only recommend to the Controller and subsequently to the Budget Committee.

Occasionally there is disagreement between the faculty and the administration as to whether or not Senate action is required on an issue, or if taken, whether it is binding or advisory. For the most part, however, the Senate is recognized as a central campus-wide governance mechanism with well accepted, if not clearly defined, authority.

---

[1] The Fringe Benefit Committee is an ad hoc group appointed by the Controller several years ago to provide him with advice on a particular fringe benefit issue.

In terms of the other constituencies in the University, meetings of the Senate are not attended by alumni, parents, or clerical employees (who are represented collectively by the Office and Professional Employees International Union, Local 391, with which the University has a negotiated contract). Ordinarily none of the public members of the Board of Trustees attend meetings of the Senate either. In 1966 and again in 1967 the Chairman of the Board was invited to address the Senate, and did so, but this event has not become custom.

Campus-Wide Governance at Roosevelt University In Relation to Eight Problem Areas

1. Clarification of Institutional Purposes

To what extent has the Senate and other campus-wide governing units discussed and helped to determine the fundamental purpose or purposes of the university? To what extent have they shown concern for balancing the competing demands of instruction, research, public service, and the like, or the competing claims of liberal arts and professional education, undergraduate and graduate study, and so on? Has campus-wide governance participated in, and been a useful vehicle for the resolution of, these issues of institutional purpose?

In discussing the role of campus-wide governance in clarifying institutional purposes at Roosevelt University, it is useful to review how the current formulation of the University's mission and purpose was arrived at. Roosevelt University entered the decade with what some believed was a certain diffuseness of objective and ambiguity of purpose. Roosevelt College began as an institution that would not discriminate. "Equal educational opportunity" was the college motto. Although never predominantly black, Roosevelt became known as a college where black students and others would be evaluated on their merits and where they would feel comfortable.

At the time of its founding in 1945 restrictive (i.e., discriminatory) covenants were still legal in real estate transactions, a racially integrated student body could not rent a hotel ballroom in downtown Chicago to hold a class dance, and black faculty and black trustees were scarcely to be found outside the traditionally all-black institutions. Because of its strongly integrationist stance, because it dared flout some of the conservative elements and traditions in the city, and because it received modest support from the liberal community in Chicago and from organized labor, some in the city and elsewhere regarded Roosevelt College as politically radical--an image without substance that remained in the public mind for many years.

Roosevelt was proud of its actions to achieve racial and ethnic integration within its academic community. This pride was the strongest element of its identity. By the early 1960s, however, non-discrimination was no longer novel, and no longer sufficient basis for an institutional identity.

When the founding president, Edward J. Sparling, retired at the end of 1963 the new president, Robert Pitchell, attempted to broaden the University's image and sense of purpose. The phrase "the University on the lakefront" appeared in some of the development literature to the dismay of many of the faculty who felt it lacked the degree of social and moral purpose that they felt had characterized the institution.

Problems developed in Dr. Pitchell's presidency and he remained in office for less than a year. He was succeeded, first on an acting basis, and in 1966 in the full presidency, by Dr. Rolf A. Weil, a long-time faculty member of the University who had been dean of the College of Business Administration. Dr. Weil was keenly aware of the need for a clarification and enhancement of the institution's mission and purpose.

The State of Illinois, which prior to 1965 had not operated a senior university in Chicago, had just opened a multi-million dollar branch of the University of Illinois at "Chicago Circle": the confluence of the city's superhighways west of the Loop. The decision to establish the Chicago Circle Campus and expand what had formerly been a two-year program of the University of Illinois at Navy Pier had created some apprehension among friends of Roosevelt University. Many wondered whether there would continue to be a need for Roosevelt. This question was raised by some of the Chicago-area business corporations, among others, when they were asked for support for the University by Dr. Weil and Board Chairman Lyle M. Spencer (president of Science Research Associates, a then recently acquired subsidiary of IBM). Board Chairman Spencer established a small committee of nationally known educators -- Ralph Tyler, Charles Dollard, and Floyd Reeves[1]--to consider the future of Roosevelt University. Dr. Weil was asked by this committee to prepare a position paper on the mission and role of Roosevelt University. In responding to this request, Dr. Weil attempted to formulate a statement of the institution's mission in a manner that would recognize the University's traditional role in educating students for upward social and economic mobility. As articulated by Weil, an integrated student body was not an end in itself but one essential element, among several, in providing an educational environment responsive to the needs of a primarily adult, urban population. Without minimizing the importance of the University's tradition of non-discrimination, President Weil's formulation enlarged the role of the institution and sharpened its focus, making it responsive to current and prospective needs and social conditions of as well as to those of the past. Implicit in his statement was the assumption that despite the development of state-supported, senior-level universities in the Chicago area, there would continue to be a need for the educational services provided by Roosevelt University to its heterogeneous, urban clientele.

Although initially drafted by the president, the Mission Statement (as it came to be called) subsequently received substantial input from the faculty, and was the subject of attention by the Planning Committee for the better part of a year. While keeping Weil's essential formulation, the Planning Committee, representing both faculty and administrators, revised the statement making it more comprehensive by reaffirming the other functions the University had traditionally performed: research and scholarship, public service, liberal education for its own sake, as well as education for economic advancement and social mobility. Although, at the time, he saw it as a watering-down of his statement, Weil was not opposed to it, and the Planning Committee's revision was subsequently accepted throughout the institution. Partly because it had taken several months and many revisions to achieve a consensus on the wording among the relatively few members of the Planning Committee, and partly because it was not deemed necessary so to do, the Senate itself was not asked to endorse or approve the Mission Statement. However, it was distributed to the faculty and was submitted to, and ratified by, the Board of Trustees.

---

[1] Charles Dollard, formerly president of the Carnegie Foundation, was then a trustee of Roosevelt University as well as of Bennington College. Floyd Reeves, a professor of higher education at The University of Chicago and later at Michigan State University, had long been involved in accreditation and college and university self-studies and evaluation. Reeves had been a trustee of Roosevelt for a short time in its early years. Ralph Tyler, director of the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, had been familiar with the history and development of Roosevelt which was founded at the time that he was a professor of education and dean of social sciences at The University of Chicago.

It was recognized by the president and the Planning Committee that a university's statement of purpose must on the one hand be sufficiently distinctive and precise so as to distinguish the institution from the others in its vicinity and constitute a guide to decision-making and the allocation of resources, and on the other hand sufficiently general and comprehensive so as to satisfy the institution's various constituencies and attain wide allegiance. This is not an easy balance to strike. Although Roosevelt University is primarily a teaching institution, it does not neglect faculty research. Although it serves primarily a part-time, commuter clientele, the full-time resident students are no less important. Although the majority of students enter after one or more years of college at other institutions, the University still recruits and is concerned with the students entering directly from high school.

The Mission Statement, while not etched in granite, has received the allegiance of the faculty and staff over the past decade and is regarded, together with the Constitution, as one of the fundamental policy documents of the University.[1] It is used as the basis for planning and decision making and is thought to be the University's basic statement of institutional purpose. Participation by the Planning Committee in the development of the Mission State. is the clearest example of the involvement of campus-wide governance in the clarification of institutional purposes at Roosevelt.

2. Clarification of Programs

It has been suggested by NCHEMS, NACUBO, Millett, and others that colleges and universities can be regarded as having two categories of activity: primary programs and support programs. Primary programs are thought to include instruction, research, public service, and, in Millett's taxonomy, student aid (i.e., the provision of access to higher education); while activities such as student services, plant operations, institutional support, academic support and auxiliary enterprises are regarded as support programs.

Although Roosevelt University makes use of the NCHEMS and NACUBO categories, and it is agreed that some of the University's activities are primary and others are secondary, it is not clear that the faculty and administration would agree with the NCHEMS-NACUBO hierarchy and distinctions. Continuing education, for example, often regarded as a public service, is seen at Roosevelt as an integral part of the University's instructional offerings. Faculty research probably receives less support than would be given to an activity regarded as primary; on the other hand, an attempt is made to provide a full array of student services.

---

[1] A copy of the Mission Statement is included as Appendix B.

The answer to the question concerning the extent to which campus-wide governance at Roosevelt has become involved in the clarification of programs and the specification of program goals is that, as with the clarification of institutional purposes, this is handled primarily through the University committee structure rather than through the Senate.[1] The Roosevelt University Senate has only rarely concerned itself with the clarification of University programs or the specification of program objectives. These are matters that receive attention by the Senate Curriculum Committee, by the Planning Committee, and, in the context of their annual effort to trim expenditures to match income, by the Budget Committee.

There were two notable occasions during the decade when the Senate did become directly involved in the clarification of programs. The first occasion was in 1967 when the Senate authorized the College (then Division) of Continuing Education to offer programs leading to the degree of Bachelor of General Studies (BGS). The distinctive elements of the BGS degree program were its concern for student competencies rather than units of credit, its use of the CLEP (College Level Examination Program) Tests to measure competencies acquired out of class and in situations for which traditional academic transcripts were not available, and its explicit orientation towards adult learners (defined as anyone over 25).

---

[1] A copy of the Roosevelt University Committee Lists showing all of the University committees is included as Appendix C.

Roosevelt's BGS program was the first non-traditional adult degree program in the area and, after those at Brooklyn College and the University of Oklahoma, one of the first in the United States. It was ahead of its time in the country, and almost ahead of its time in the Roosevelt University Senate. Several senators expressed objections to it, seemingly suspicious of any baccalaureate degree program that did not require the ritual calculation of 120 semester hours and which would give credit for out-of-class learning or "life experience" as it was then referred to. Ultimately the Senate did approve the BGS program which soon became the fastest growing component of the University and the one for which the University received the most outside acclaim.

In many respects, the approval of the BGS program by the Senate signaled a shift in curricular emphasis at Roosevelt. Prior to that time the University had combined a non-traditional (read: innovative, progressive, avant garde) governance structure with a highly traditional curriculum. In 1965 the University's curriculum and list of required courses were essentially the same as that which had existed at the Central YMCA College twenty years before. By 1975 and beginning with the development of the General Studies Program in Continuing Education, Roosevelt had made major revisions of its curriculum in every college and had developed a variety of non-traditional or experimental activities including an external degree variant of the BGS program in the College of Continuing Education.

In 1971 the Senate again became directly involved in program clarification, this time in the field of teacher education. The issue was whether or not the Department of Education, then the largest unit in the College of Arts and Sciences, should be separated from that College and reconstituted as a College of Education. A proposal to establish a College of Education had been initiated by the Department and was strongly endorsed by the dean of faculties. It was supported by many who saw it as an opportunity for the teacher education programs to receive greater autonomy and to flourish under the stronger administrative leadership that might be provided by a dean rather than a department chairman. It was opposed by those who were concerned about expanding teacher education at a time when the demand for teachers had already begun to diminish and by those who were apprehensive about the implications for greater resource allocation to Education in preference to their own disciplines. To many observers it appeared that the underlying, if largely unspoken, issues in the debate about the proposed College of Education were power and money, rather than program.

In the end, after four months of debate in the Senate and a constitutional referendum among The Faculty, the proposal to establish a College of Education was adopted and was ratified by the Board of Trustees.

It is an interesting aside to note that the College of Education issue had been raised twenty-two years before, in 1949. At that time the proposal, although approved by the president and most of the administration, as well as by the Senate, was ultimately defeated by the faculty-elected members of the Board of Trustees who successfully urged the Board to establish a special fund-raising goal for the College as a condition of its establishment. When the specified funds were not raised, even after the deadline was extended, the idea was dropped. This did not happen in 1971.

Outside of these two notable exceptions, the clarification of instructional programs has routinely taken place in the Curriculum Committee and the clarification of other programs in the Academic Conference, the Administrative Council, the Planning Committee, and in various bodies other than the Senate.

3. Clarification of Budget Priorities

The formulation of a budget is an exercise in distributing anticipated income among competing claims. At Roosevelt University the budget is formulated by a Budget Committee composed, as has been mentioned, of equal numbers of faculty members and administrators. This committee annually reviews the requests submitted by all units of the University: academic, student services, administrative, library, etc., and determines how the anticipated revenues should be apportioned.

Because the functioning of a committee such as this is dependent upon the composition of its membership, it may be useful to review the change that was made in Budget Committee membership during the decade. As was mentioned earlier, the Budget Committee, when established in 1951, included six faculty members elected by the Senate and six administrative officers: the president, the controller, the dean of faculties, and the deans of Arts and

Sciences, Business, and Music. This twelve-person committee negotiated all the budgets during the years between 1951 and 1967.

When Dr. Weil became president in 1965, he inherited a large accumulated deficit. Substantial deficits had occurred in each of the three prior years, and the University's credit was running low. One of the instructions given him by the Board chairman was to eliminate the deficit and see that it did not reoccur. It was obvious to Weil that the situation called for attention in at least three areas: increased fund raising to generate new revenue, tighter fiscal control over expenditures, and more cautious and conservative budget making. Together with his controller and the Development Office, he was able to take decisive administrative action on the first two matters.

The problem of budget making was more complex. First it was necessary to accurately diagnose the cause of the problem. Why had unrealistic budgets been prepared? Was it simply that the Committee included faculty members who were urging higher faculty salaries? If so, then the Budget Committee should probably be abandoned in favor of another method. Weil diagnosed the problem as more subtle. In his judgment, the inflated budgets were caused by a committee of unwieldy size coupled with the presence thereon of the academic deans. The Committee provided a forum for each dean to advocate increased expenditures in his area. Most did not abuse this forum, but some were able to develop a tacit understanding with some of the faculty members that increases in faculty salaries would not be opposed if attempts by the controller or the president to cut the dean's budget requests were resisted. This kind of "log rolling," even if it happened only occasionally, was enough to thwart the efforts of the president to achieve a balanced and conservative budget responsive to the needs of the whole institution.

There were other problems associated with the Budget Committee. Several of [illegible] senior administrators were not included, notably the graduate dean and the dean of students. They felt at a disadvantage in having their requests approved. If faculty-administrative parity was to be maintained, adding them to the Committee would have meant adding two additional faculty and creating an even more unwieldy group. Because this was a matter that had involved the Senate, the president asked the Planning Committee to study the problem and formulate a recommendation for Senate action. After giving considerable attention to alternative models and strategies of budget making, and to alternative committee structures, the Planning Committee recommended that the Budget Committee be reduced in size from 12 to 6 members consisting of the president, the controller, and the dean of faculties, matched by a like number of faculty elected by the Senate. The recommendation was opposed by some of the faculty senators who saw it as an administrative maneuver to reduce the number of faculty representatives on the Committee and by most of the academic deans who saw it as a means to undercut their power. Ultimately rational arguments and the good counsel of the graduate dean who chaired the Planning Committee prevailed and the proposed change to a six-member Committee was adopted by the Senate in 1967. Some observers allege that the outcome might have been different had the dean who was most strongly opposed to the change not been away from the University on a sick leave during this period: such are the vicissitudes of University governance.

The revised committee has functioned well since then. The University has maintained a balanced budget during the past eight years, has removed the accumulated deficit, and, as the result of a successful fund drive, has completed a long list of planned projects and programs. Despite the Budget Committee's improved functioning, however, it is still an annual struggle to apportion the always inadequate funds among the always well-justified requests. Some years the screams and tears are louder than usual, but always there is much gnawing of cigars and gnashing of teeth.

It is clear to the members of the Budget Committee that they engage in the process of trade-offs: monies allocated for one purpose or program are not available for another. In determining these allocations, the Budget Committee looks closely at course enrollments (i. e., the income generated and students served by each department). Although a variety of issues are considered by the Budget Committee--quality of programs, strength of the faculty and administrative leadership, prior commitments, standards and guidelines of accrediting agencies, ability of the program to generate government and foundation support, etc.--a dominant concern is the relationship between income and costs. Programs in areas of growing enrollment tend to be treated more favorably than those in areas of declining enrollment.

In periods of overall University growth the relationship between income and costs is relatively easy for the Budget Committee to maintain. It can even be maintained without too much difficulty in areas of declining enrollment where there is a "cushion" of part-time or non tenure-line faculty. However, in recent years the Budget Committee at Roosevelt has been grappling with a hydra familiar to those burdened with the same challenge at comparable institutions. One head of this monster is the dilemma caused by enrollments which, although relatively stable overall, are increasing rapidly in certain programs and decreasing in others. Since this enrollment shift has been going on for several years, primarily away from the liberal arts and sciences in favor of professional programs, the "cushion" in the areas of declining enrollment has already been used up and it is excrutiatingly difficult to shift resources (i. e., full-time faculty positions) away from the areas of decline to the areas of growth. The departments with declining enrollment make the argument that a university must maintain certain liberal arts programs despite their enrollment decline, at least at a minimum or skeletal size. For some of them the minimum size may have been reached. Their argument is balanced by the counter-claim from the rapidly growing departments that they are being "short-changed" in the ratio between income and budget authorizations and are carrying an unfair burden of support for these other programs.

A second dilemma facing the Budget Committee is the inexorably rising administrative cost associated with the increasingly complex and far-reaching governmental forms and regulations. This problem is not always easy to explain to the faculty who are relatively unaware of the administrative burdens of compliance with Affirmative Action, OSHA, EEOC, HEGIS, and the like.[1]

---

[1] The dimensions of this problem are well described in an editorial in Change: "Will Government Patronage Kill the Universities?" (Winter 1975-76, pp. 10-13 ff).

Partly because of the large faculty involvement in budget making at Roosevelt, and partly because of the chronic under-funding, Roosevelt University has never had adequate administrative staff support. The University has no personnel office, for example, no planning office, no budget analyst, no in-house attorney, no resident architect or interior designer, no full-time assistant or associate deans (except for one in admissions and records), no evening dean or summer school dean or extension-center dean, no provost and no assistant or associate vice presidents.[1] The Budget Committee finds it difficult to agree to expenditures for administrative staff when academic staff is being curtailed in many areas. Inevitably, however, if the University is to survive, the Committee will have to come to recognize the increased "costs of doing business" in an era of increasing regulation and litigation.

A third problem facing the Budget Committee is that of inflationary cost increases which in most enterprises are passed on to the consumer or the taxpayer. At a private university, competing for students with the tax-subsidized institutions, there is a limit as to how far tuition can be increased. Tuition increases cause students to transfer to public universities or reduce the number of courses for which they enroll. In fact at Roosevelt over the past decade, despite increases in the (headcount) enrollment, there have been decreases in the average number of semester hours for which students enroll. Because tuition is charged by the semester-hour this may mean a decline in income at a time when there are more individuals to serve. The magnitude of the problem is apparent when one recognizes that about 85 per cent of the University's budget comes from student tuition. This is a relationship that has held relatively constant over the University's history. Despite recent substantial increases in the level of fund raising, it is likely to remain. Moreover, the problem is compounded by the fact that the maximum award under the Illinois State Scholarship and Grant Program, although relatively high compared with many other states, has not kept pace with tuition increases and today provides a lower fraction of the student's educational expenses than it did ten years ago.

---

[1] At Roosevelt the title of vice president is an honorific conferred by the Board, on the president's recommendation, to four of the administrators who report directly to the president. Thus, the director of development is also the vice president for development, the dean of students is the vice president for student affairs, the dean of faculties is the vice president for academic affairs, and the controller-treasurer is the vice president for business and finance.

Lest the budget picture appear a matter of unrelieved gloom, it should be said that the Committee has been able to fund a substantial number of new academic programs over the past decade and make considerable progress in the area of library holdings, faculty and staff salaries, and physical plant maintenance: not enough progress perhaps, but considerable.

In 1972, as the result of the dissatisfaction of some of the department chairmen with the budget-making process, the Senate voted to establish a broadly representative Committee to Study the Budgetary Process. This Committee, under the chairmanship of the head of the public administration program, deliberated for a number of months and issued a report generally supportive of the existing budgetary process. The report did include a series of recommendations, chief among which were the modest suggestions, since carried out, that more time be provided for budget administrators to appear before the Committee to present their case, and that if budget cuts have to be made that they be done with the chairman or reported to him or her right away rather than by the Committee with a long hiatus between the cut and the notification. In effect there was no major disagreement with the budget-making procedure. The Budget Committee continues to formulate the budget and clarify budget priorities. For the past three years, however, the president and the other members of the Budget Committee, at the request of the Senate, have made a formal report to the faculty concerning their decisions and recommendations.

One other change in budget procedure, this one at the Board level, was made during the decade: the Board established a small Budget Review Committee composed only of public (i.e., non-faculty members of the Board) to evaluate the proposed budget prior to action by the Board. In one or two instances this Budget Review Committee has modified the Budget Committee's recommendations: increasing the allowance for building maintenance and increasing tuition to cover the expense. The Budget Review Committee was another precaution, urged by Board Chairman Spencer, against a repetition of the unrealistic budget making of the early '60s.

4. Income Development

As has been observed, approximately 85 per cent of Roosevelt University's income is from student tuition. Fund raising from government and private sources is important and has grown considerably in recent years--in some areas it has become very important--but overall it accounts for only a small fraction of the total revenue. As might be expected, therefore, the Budget Committee has given considerable attention to the problem of income development from the perspective of enrollment and tuition. The revenue consequences of changes in enrollment are discussed and well understood by the Budget Committee; the revenue consequences of changes in tuition are also discussed but less well understood since increases in tuition are offset by a loss of some students and a decline in the number of semester hours taken by others.

Although the Budget Committee does not follow a precise formula, it tries to maintain a general relationship between anticipated income and projected expenditures in each area. The pattern of support received by a program or activity from outside funding agencies is also considered. For example, when the State of Illinois expanded its scholarship and grant program to provide substantial student aid support on the basis of economic need rather than academic scholarship, the University was able to shift some of its own student aid funds towards the support of academically superior students rather than for those most economically disadvantaged.

The Senate is only slightly less sophisticated about the relationship of enrollment to income, although the perspective of the Senate is different from that of the Budget Committee. Faculty members tend to take the position that enrollment growth and income development are administrative responsibilities, whereas program development and "maintaining academic standards" are faculty responsibilities. When the president reported a comparatively good fiscal year recently, one senator inquired whether that meant that the University's admissions criteria could be raised.

Government grant awards and major private donations from foundations, corporations, labor unions, and individuals are regularly reported to the Senate by the president. Senators and other faculty members have also been kept informed of grant opportunities and the status of pending legislation that might have a direct economic impact for the University. The faculty and administrators have been asked to make financial donations to the University themselves. A request for contributions has been made in the Senate at the beginning of each major fund drive. In general, however, the Senate has not become deeply involved in income development and does not understand income development to be a part of its function.

Review of endowment policy and consideration of ways to increase endowment income is a matter handled by the Board of Trustees rather than by the Senate. However, the Board committee on investment policy currently happens to include a faculty trustee (the chairman of the Finance Department). At Roosevelt endowment income constitutes only about one percent of the operating budget.

5. Program Technology and Management

Program technology (that is, developing and improving the systems and procedures of work by which programs are carried out) and management (that is, coordinating and directing the work to be performed) are essentially administrative rather than legislative functions. At Roosevelt, therefore, program technology and management tend to be the province of the administrative bodies--the Administrative Council and the Academic Conference--and the administrative officers (chairmen, deans, vice presidents), rather than of the Senate or Senate committees. The Administrative Council, for example, has been concerned with such questions and issues as registration and pre-registration procedures, minimum class size, whether there should be open or closed stacks in the library, how the affirmative action program should be administered, and the like. Although these matters are often reported to the Senate, they are seldom matters for Senate action.

Two years ago Roosevelt began developing a system of "administration by objectives" as one of a number of ways to improve its managerial and administrative processes. Thus far, this system has been confined to the level of vice presidents and deans, although the possibility of extending it more widely through the institution has been discussed.

6. Program Requirements and Outcomes

Millett has observed that a university's "instructional programs usually involve two sets of student requirements: an admissions standard and a completion (or degree) standard." At Roosevelt, changes in admissions policy or criteria are recommended by the Admissions Committee, a small standing committee with both faculty and administrative members. Major changes in the University's admissions policy must then be approved by the Academic Conference or the Administrative Council and by the University Senate.

One change in admissions policy--referred to as "the five year moratorium rule"--was approved by the Senate in 1969. The need for this change grew out of Roosevelt's increased role in the education of older students. Roosevelt has many mature applicants who have had one or more years of college for which they were enrolled five, ten or more years ago. When asked to provide transcripts of prior academic work, some of these applicants present a record of low grades, perhaps having led to probation or academic dismissal. Not infrequently the low grades were earned when the applicants were 18 or 19 years old. Now in their late twenties or thirties, they have had many intervening years of successful and maturing work and family experience. It was University policy to deny admission to applicants who were on academic probation at another college or university and to those who had been dismissed for poor scholarship from Roosevelt or elsewhere. A moratorium on prior academic difficulty was thought desirable so that the slate could be "wiped clean" for applicants who had been out of school five or more years and whose achievements in other areas of life now indicated a likelihood of successful school performance. Although a few eyebrows were raised, most faculty thought the proposal reasonable and fair and the matter easily passed the Senate. Subsequently, many students have entered or returned to Roosevelt under the moratorium rule and have graduated with excellent records.

One or two other minor changes in the University's probation and reinstatement policy were adopted by the Senate over the decade. These changes were occasioned by a growing sensitivity to the problems and needs of Roosevelt's clientele of older, part-time students.

The Senate has, on at least two occasions, rejected the suggestion that junior class standing be given to every student entering with an associate of Arts degree. The senators know the majority of students enter Roosevelt as transfer students from one of the community colleges in Chicago, but they believe each student's record should be evaluated individually for transfer credit.

The Roosevelt Senate has been less concerned about the problem of outcomes or standards of student performance. Performance standards are regarded as a matter to be determined by the college, the department, or the individual faculty member. The Senate has been concerned from time to time with University grading policies when reminded of these policies by the dean of faculties. Reminders have occurred after gross violations have taken place such as the assignment by several faculty members of all A's, as happened during the Viet Nam War draft, or the too-liberal use of "incomplete" or "L" ("withdrew") grades. Although it has reaffirmed the grading policy, the Senate has not set performance standards for programs or degrees.

The administration has been concerned, as have many faculty members, about the academic capability of the graduates and how satisfied they feel with the educational experience they had at Roosevelt. The decennial self-study undertaken prior to a regional accreditation review by the North Central Association was an occasion for a special effort to gather data on these matters. As had been done some years previously, all baccalaureate degree candidates were required to take the Graduate Record Examination so that standardized data could be obtained to compare the Roosevelt students' performance with that of students in comparable departments in other institutions. Similarly, an extensive questionnaire was sent to all recent graduates to evaluate their satisfaction with their experiences at Roosevelt. This was a useful study in that it revealed certain problem areas about which the University was not fully aware and a reassuring study because it revealed that most of the alumni respondents have a high positive regard for the educational experiences they had at the University.

For many years the University has operated an Office of Placement and Career Planning. Although many of the older students are already employed, and see their degrees as an avenue of upward mobility within their present companies, many take advantage of the placement service, as do younger graduates seeking their first full-time job. The placement director has regularly monitored the success that students have had in obtaining satisfactory employment. Moreover, he has conducted training sessions for students in such matters as how to prepare a resume, what to anticipate in an employment interview, how to select an employer, how to find "hidden" or "non-existent" jobs, etc. However, program outcomes and the ability of students to find employment generally have not been discussed by the Senate or by other campus-wide groups.

7. Academic and Student Behavior

Student behavior becomes the subject of attention when it is disruptive or appears bizarre. Roosevelt is no exception to this rule. A number of times during the '60s there were student demonstrations of various kinds. Some of these demonstrations involved only a handful of students for a short period, as when a small group picketed the Trustees meeting in October, 1966, at which Dr. Weil was confirmed as president, protesting the absence of student involvement in the selection process. Sometimes they involved a specific group of students as when a number of black students disrupted and boycotted classes early in 1969 to accentuate their demand for an expansion of the Black Studies Program. Sometimes large numbers of students were involved as when there was a general moratorium on classes in May, 1970, following the invasion of

Cambodia and the killings at Kent State and Jackson State. Other demonstrations during the decade included a sit-in in 1967 protesting the University's "cooperation with the draft" by sending the data on class-standing to the draft boards of students who had applied for deferment, and protests in 1968 concerning the president's and dean of faculty's decision not to appoint the controversial historian Staughton Lynd to a full-time teaching position. Most of these events and the demonstrations they gave rise to were discussed in the University Senate.

Some of these student demonstrations fell within the bounds of acceptable, that is non-disruptive, dissent. Some went beyond. Although the University had had policies and procedures regarding student behavior, these policies proved inadequate and in need of revision. In 1969 the Administrative Council, after lengthy discussion, revised the student code of conduct and judicial review procedure (i.e., the procedure by which students may appeal judicial, that is disciplinary, decisions). Although revised by an administrative body rather than the Senate, an extensive effort was made to see that there was agreement and support from student and faculty leaders. The procedures then adopted (see Appendix C) have remained operative and unchanged since that time.

In January, 1966, and at several other times during the decade, the students requested greater representation and participation in the University's committee structure. The Student Senate presented the University Senate with a lengthy list of the committees on which they wanted representation. After much discussion in the Senate and in the Administrative Council, a somewhat shorter list was agreed upon. The students were allowed a representative on the Curriculum, Planning, and Arts committees, and two representatives on the Bookstore, International Student, and Library committees.

Recently (January, 1976) a constitutional amendment was adopted that will add a student representative to the Teacher Education Committee. It should be noted that the student body had, prior to the beginning of the decade, already been represented on the Commencement Committee, on the Senate itself, and on the Senate-established student-faculty committees: the Student Activities Board and the Torch Publication Board.

After having obtained representation on these committees, the students seemed to lose interest in their newly won rights. In some years the Student Senate did not bother to nominate representatives; and some of the representatives, when selected, did not bother to attend.[1] Perhaps the students began to feel that the "real action" took place elsewhere than in committee meetings. The students began to seek participation in the meetings of several of the academic departments. In May, 1970, this matter was brought to the attention of the Senate by the chairman of the Academic Conference and referred to the Curriculum Committee. Some of the departments had been under student and faculty pressure to allow students to participate in departmental meetings and vote in department elections on personnel issues and curriculum decisions.

---

[1] The Senate Minutes of May 25, 1970, contain the following sentences typical of the experience encountered by other committees: "The Curriculum Committee of the Senate met on Monday of this week. No student representatives were present and no word has been received from the Student Senate." In the Senate meeting on January 21, 1976, the dean of students informed the student representative and the other senators that during the past three years no students had been nominated by the Student Senate to serve on the Judicial Review Board.

To sanction student participation, but to specify its limits, the Curriculum Committee returned to the Senate with the following resolution:

> 1) In constitutionally established personnel and representative actions student representatives may be permitted a separate advisory vote. These actions are: appointment, reappointment, indefinite tenure, promotion, extension of service, and balloting for chairmen and representatives to the Senate and the Graduate Council;
>
> 2) With regard to other matters, each department may establish its own procedures for student participation provided that student voting strength not exceed 1/4th the voting strength of the eligible voting faculty members of the department.

Some senators were opposed to any student representation in department meetings, others felt that their participation in personnel matters and elections should not be limited to an advisory vote, and that the limitation of one-fourth of the voting strength specified in the second paragraph should be removed or liberalized to one-half. As is common in Senate actions, the middle view prevailed. After a brisk debate, the resolution was passed.

In 1969 the University opened a 360 bed, seventeen-story dormitory constructed adjacent to the main academic building on Wabash Avenue in downtown Chicago. Both the administration and the faculty made a conscious and successful effort not to become involved in determining housing regulations or parietal rules for the students living in the dormitory. The facility operates more like a student hotel than like a traditional campus dormitory, and the students themselves have established certain rules regulating their own behavior.

Although there is no formal collective bargaining agreement with the faculty, faculty rights and responsibilities are enumerated in various documents, of which the foremost is The Faculty Constitution. Although changes require ratification by the Board of Trustees, the Constitution is the province of the Senate. The Senate probably spends more time discussing proposed constitutional amendments and questionable constitutional interpretations than on any other single issue or concern. The Constitution, which enumerates faculty rights and rules of procedure, is regarded very seriously, and is studied very closely, by both the faculty and the administration. In some respects the Constitution resembles a collective bargaining agreement in its discussion of membership, its provision of grievance procedures, and so on. The most obvious difference is the omission in the Constitution of a wage and salary scale or specification of teaching load.

The Constitution is regarded by the faculty as one of the principal guarantees of their rights and privileges. It not only specifies certain faculty rights, but provides limits to the actions of the administration, a matter of equal or greater importance in the minds of some. The meticulous attention to constitutional detail suggests that the senators regard the University's governance structures as infinitely perfectable: with enough attention to detail, an optimum form of governance can be created.

One constitutional issue perennially debated is which of the administrative or professional staff should be members of "The Faculty" and given the right to vote on constitutional referenda and on votes of confidence for the president, the dean of students, and the dean of faculties. A sizeable number of the professional staff, particularly those in positions that have been added over the past decade, are "disenfranchised" and have been kept from this minimal but symbolic participation in University governance.

Although at its inception Roosevelt pioneered a form of campus-wide governance that minimized the distinction between teaching faculty and professional administrative staff, in recent years Roosevelt has not been immune from the tension between faculty and administration that has infected so many campuses. It is not simply a tension between the teaching faculty and the supervisory officers of the University, because the faculty tend to regard any professional employee from the assistant to the registrar to the president as an administrator and part of "the administration." Although there is often obvious and public disagreement between members of the administrative staff on various issues, the faculty tend to see them as a monolithic group, supportive of one another, thinking and voting en bloc, and uncritically loyal to the president and to their respective vice presidents.

In reaction to this view, and to affirm rights which they feel are neglected or lost between the constitution-protected faculty rights on the one hand and prerogatives of the senior administrators on the other, a group of the professional administrative staff began to hold regular meetings about two years ago. Many of them were afraid of being short-changed on fringe benefits and other matters. They did provide significant advice to the controller and the Administrative Council on a revision of vacation benefits for administrative staff which made these benefits more equitable and uniform, and on several other issues. The group continues to meet periodically to discuss more neutral and academic issues and, in accordance with the constitutional provision, to elect a senator. It was, in fact, the right to elect a senator that occasioned their meeting in the first place.

8. Program Evaluation

Roosevelt University has given considerable attention to the matters of evaluation, reporting and accountability. Relatively little, if any, of this attention has taken place in the Senate, however. Every dean and administrative department director submits an annual report to the president. These reports are distributed widely throughout the institution and copies are placed in the library. The controller's annual report is audited by a public accounting firm and distributed to the senior administrative officers and to the Board of Trustees. A copy is also placed in the library. The president prepares an annual report for the Board of Trustees and for the faculty. Since 1965 the president's report has been published for distribution to University friends and supporters. For the past three years the president has held a special meeting of the faculty to deliver his report orally and answer questions.

Two years ago the Administrative Council agreed to establish a system of "administration by objectives" ("management" sounded too harsh and industrial). In its simplest form, and stripped of detail and nuances, ABO is a system of evaluation and accountability that operates with administrators preparing a list of their objectives for the year, arriving at an agreement with their supervisor regarding this list, and subsequently having their progress towards these objectives reviewed in meetings with their supervisor and in their annual reports.

In addition to administration by objectives and to regular reporting, various other forms of evaluation take place during the year. The effectiveness of the University's efforts to recruit qualified students is measured at each registration. The operating efficiency, economy and cost-effectiveness is measured annually by the Budget Committee and by the Board's Budget Review Committee. The effectiveness of the academic programs is measured periodically when students and alumni sit for the Graduate Record Examination, when they take the Medical School Admissions Test, the Certified Public Accountants Exam, and other academic and professional certification exams. The University is evaluated regularly by a number of accrediting agencies including the North Central Association, the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business, the National Council on the Accreditation of Teacher Education, the American Chemical Society, the National Association of Schools of Music, the Council on Social Work, among others.

The Senate was concerned with accountability when, in 1968, it voted to recommend that faculty place copies of their course examinations and syllabi in the library where students who might be considering taking the course could have ready access to them. Although some members of the faculty have not followed this recommendation, as too much trouble or violative of their "academic freedom," a great many have, thereby making them publicly accountable, to a larger extent than before, for the content of their courses.

The president and the dean of faculties are regularly accountable to the Senate and to the faculty in their monthly and annual reports. They and the deans are accountable in the required triennial votes of confidence.

The Senate itself has not become involved in the valuation of specific academic programs, although the Teacher Education Committee and other university-wide committees have.

Summary and Conclusions

In the preceeding pages, the functioning of the Roosevelt University Senate and other campus-wide governing bodies in eight major areas of collegiate decision-making identified by Millett have been discussed. It was not the purpose of this case study to evaluate the particular decisions made, and there was no attempt to do so. Nor was there an attempt to record completely and exhaustively all of the decisions made in each of these eight areas. Rather, an attempt was made to provide illustrative examples of the extent to which campus-wide governance at Roosevelt was involved in the problems and issues of these eight areas and its contribution to the decisions reached concerning these problems and issues. This case study was particularly concerned with the University Senate and with several major campus-wide committees: Budget, Curriculum, and Planning, among others. For a view of another aspect of campus-wide governance at Roosevelt University, the reader was referred to an earlier study, by the same author, on the functioning of the University's Board of Trustees on which there are seven faculty-elected representatives.

It is clear that campus-wide governance has functioned more actively and made greater contributions in some of the problem areas than in others. It appears to this analyst that campus-wide governance at Roosevelt has played an active and important problem-formulating and decision-making role in the areas of "clarification of institutional priorities," where the Planning Committee was instrumental in formulating and in reaching agreement upon the statement of the University's mission; "the clarification of budget priorities," where the faculty and administrative Budget Committee serves to formulate and negotiate the annual budget of the University; and in the area of "academic and student behavior" where the Senate has devoted much attention to the constitutional issues of identifying faculty rights and responsibilities and regulating participation in university governance.

A much smaller contribution has been made in the areas of "income development," which is generally not seen as a faculty responsibility; "program technology and management," which are regarded as departmental rather than campus-wide concerns; and "program evaluation" which is undertaken more on an administrative than a campus-wide governance level.

In reviewing the activities of the University Senate over the past decade, it appears that next to the time consumed in listening and reacting to reports from the president and from the chairmen of standing committees, the Senate has spent more time considering proposed amendments to the Constitution than it has on any other matter. The reasons for this protracted concern with the Constitution are not altogether clear. Partly they seem to be the result of a view of the University's governing structure as infinitely perfectable, partly they may result from a view of the Constitution as similar to a collective bargaining agreement in which certain rights, privileges, responsibilities, and governing procedures are specified and concerning which there is repeated negotiating and numerous attempts to clarify and interpret. Partly, too, attention spent on constitutional and governance issues may avoid having to deal with more difficult or troublesome concerns such as income development, student retention, or program evaluation. These are tough problems that may be best avoided or left to the administration or some other body. Were the Senate to become more involved in areas such as "program management," however, it is not clear that their efforts would be welcomed by department chairmen, division directors, deans and others who may see this as their domain of responsibility.

In the estimate of this observer and others whose judgment he has obtained, campus-wide governance has operated with reasonable success at Roosevelt over the past decade. Decisions made by the Senate have reflected the views of a majority of the faculty and have been seen by most as reasonable and sensible (even if the debate by which they were arrived at sometimes seems devoid of reason, logic, or good sense). The financial resources of Roosevelt University are relatively meager, but there is widespread discussion and general agreement about and knowledge of their allocation. Some dissatisfaction exists, as it is bound to, but the grievance procedures have functioned effectively to channel student and faculty distress and have provided opportunities for redress and conciliation. There is relatively little empire building at Roosevelt, perhaps because there is relatively little opportunity for it.

Roosevelt University is certainly not an academic utopia. Faculty and administrative morale are subject to the same swings and vicissitudes as are experienced elsewhere. Nonetheless, the University's highly democratic and participatory governing structure does seem to have a positive effect. There is high awareness of, and general agreement regarding, the University's mission and there has been a relatively low rate of faculty turn-over. There is open debate on virtually all issues and senators exercise their right to raise literally any concern. Most issues are discussed extensively before one or more of the campus-wide committees or in the Senate itself and broad faculty input is achieved. There has been somewhat less success in achieving sustained student input, however, perhaps because so many of the students are older, enrolled [illegible] part-time, and busy with jobs, families, and other concerns.

Most of the members of the University staff, faculty and administrators alike, are aware of the University's successful and continuing struggle in an extremely competitive environment in which it is surrounded by a host of state-supported junior and senior level colleges and universities as well as by a number of independent institutions. These other institutions stand ready to absorb Roosevelt's students should this University cease to be competitive or viable. Not only has Roosevelt experienced a gradual overall enrollment increase over the past decade, despite the enormous expansion of the state-subsidized system during this time, but in ten out of the past eleven years the University has had a balanced operating budget. This record and the efforts on which it is based is not lost on the faculty and staff. Nor does it intimidate them, however, from continuing to make demands upon the administration or from seeking an even larger role in institutional governance.

At the beginning of the report it was noted that Millett advanced three alternative hypotheses to explain the operation of campus-wide governance. These hypotheses are:

> 1) ". . . that a campus internally is comprised of various interest groups and that these interest groups struggle for power to impose their goals and their beliefs upon other interest groups. Campus wide governance then becomes a political process of achieving majority coalitions that can decide issues on a compromise, or at least common agreement basis."

2) ". . . that the campus internally represents an organized anarchy whose objective is to keep goals problematic, technology uncertain, and decision-making individualistic. As a consequence, the idea of campus-wide governance is unrealistic and performance of such governance in terms of decision-making is maintained at a minimum level of effectiveness."

3) ". . . that the concept of organizational dualism between faculty affairs and administrative affairs has been maintained over recent years, but communication and interaction between the two sets of activities has been greatly advanced."

If required to choose a single hypothesis among these three that comes closest to describing the events at Roosevelt over the past decade, this observer would select the first. There are various interest groups in the University--the several colleges, the departments, the students, the secretarial staff, the student service personnel, and so on--each of which has its own interests which must be balanced and compromised. The existence of multiple interest groups was intensely clear during the period of student unrest when at one point the president was attempting to negotiate a compromise between several factions of students, at least two factions in his administrative council, and several factions in the faculty. (At one point during these negotiations one of the president's assistants resigned because he felt the president had gone too far in appeasing a group of students. At that moment compromise seemed almost unattainable.)

In many respects, however, university governance defies summation in a single hypothesis. At different times different hypotheses seem to operate. For example, in the absence of a strong executive, the competition among the various interest groups becomes anarchic, at which time the second hypothesis prevails. During the past decade, Roosevelt has had strong presidential leadership which has counteracted this tendency towards anarchy. At various times, however, one or another unit of the university has had inadequately strong subordinate leadership and something close to anarchy existed for a time in that area until a new and stronger administrative director, department chairman, or dean was chosen.

Sometimes, and over certain issues, the various constituencies and components become aligned between "the faculty" and "the administration." In fact, there are some groups that believe their interests are advanced by emphasizing the distinction between faculty and administration. At these times, and over these issues, a vote in the Senate may be divided largely along faculty-administrative lines. At these times it would appear that the third hypothesis prevails. A number of observers have expressed the belief that the organizational dualism or dichotomy between faculty and administration has increased in recent years and become more pronounced. If this is true, it may have resulted from a more professional administrative operation than existed in earlier years and from a tendency for an institution to reflect the prejudices, preconceptions, and stereotypes that appear in the literature and that exist on other campuses. In this respect Roosevelt is less unique now than it was at the time of its founding when town meeting governance prevailed.

Another problem with the adequacy of the first hypothesis is that it fails to recognize the fluidity of the various interest groups. An individual might find his interests affected by virtue of his membership in a particular department or college, by virtue of his being a tenured or non-tenured member of the faculty, by virtue of his service on a particular committee, by virtue of his standing to benefit more from certain fringe benefits than from others, and so on. The interest groups are fluid, coalescing around particular issues and then dissolving. Individuals may not be aware of a shared area of interest until a particular issue arises.

Various groupings of people coalesce as spokesmen emerge to articulate a particular issue or viewpoint. The force and influence of personalities should not be overlooked or minimized. A single individual may serve on as many as five or six key committees, councils, conferences or boards so that his or her influence is magnified many times. An interest group or coalition may emerge only once, over some special issue, or may reappear at intervals. A strong executive tries to reduce these factional groupings and differences by emphasizing the community of interests that exist between all the constituents of the institution. A weaker leader may try to take advantage of the power struggle between groups by manipulating interest groups against one another. A very weak administrator, or an average administrator in a situation with inadequate structure or authority, may not be able to lead even to that extent and so will experience the anarchic and chaotic situation of the driver whose horses are all pulling in different directions at once.

Collective bargaining may be more likely to occur in a setting when faculty members perceive a common or shared pool of interests distinct from those of the administration than it is where strong departments or colleges are jealous of each other's perquisites and see themselves as rivals, i.e., in an institution approaching the third hypothesis more closely than the first or second.

Campus governance is not only a "political process of achieving majority coalitions that can decide on a compromise or . . . common agreement," as suggested by the first hypothesis, but also a process of identifying and solving problems before a faction or special interest group is formed. The strong and creative university executive, therefore, may spend less time negotiating compromise agreements between factions or interest groups, some of which is inevitable, than in providing the leadership necessary to enable all constituents to see their common or shared interests and in identifying and solving problems before they emerge as issues for factionalism, negotiation, and compromise. This may be the difference between the president who is a leader and one who is merely a broker or mediator. It appears to this observer that strong presidential leadership within the framework of a highly egalitarian and participatory governing structure has been characteristic of the governance at Roosevelt over the past decade.

APPENDIXES

Appendix A: Constitution of the Faculty and By Laws of Roosevelt University

Appendix B: The Mission of Roosevelt University

Appendix C: The Student Code of Conduct and the Judicial Review Board Composition and Procedure

Appendix D: Roosevelt University Committee List

APPENDIX A

Constitution of the Faculty and By Laws of Roosevelt University

CONSTITUTION OF THE FACULTY
ROOSEVELT UNIVERSITY

(Including amendments ratified through March, 1974)

PREAMBLE

We, the members of the Faculty of Roosevelt University, in order to establish an association of free men and women dedicated to the enlightenment of the human spirit and the improvement and preservation of the best in American education, to insure the harmonious functioning of all parts of this association through the practice of democracy by the Student Body, the Faculty, and the Board of Trustees, and to define the responsibilities of all and protect the rights of all, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the Faculty of Roosevelt University.

ARTICLE I

THE FACULTY

SECTION 1. Appointment to the Faculty.

All members of the Teaching and/or Research Faculty shall be appointed by the President after hearing the recommendations of the Dean of the College in which the appointment is sought and of the Chairman of the Department and its voting members. The Graduate Faculty shall be appointed by the President after he hears the recommendations of the Dean of the College, the Chairman of the Department and its voting members, the Dean of the Graduate Faculty, and the Graduate Council.

SECTION 2. Membership of the Faculty.

Clause 1. The membership of the University Faculty shall consist of two groups:

(1) The regular, or voting members;
(2) The associate, or non-voting members.

Clause 2. The regular, or voting, membership shall consist of:

(1) All those who hold tenure-line (see Article V, Sect. 1), full-time, teaching appointments; and all those who hold tenure-line, full-time research appointments; and all those who hold tenure-line, full-time combinations of teaching and research appointments; and those on extension of service contracts who have previously been tenured;

2

(2) Those members of the administrative staff whose duties bring them into close contact with student or academic affairs and whose academic qualifications are comparable to those in (1) above. The following are eligible under this definition: the President, the Vice Presidents, the Deans, the Directors of non-credit divisions, the Assistant to the President, the librarians, the Registrar, the Director of Admissions, the Director of Counseling and Testing, the full-time professionally trained counselors, the Director of Placement, the Director of Student Activities, the Director of the Health Service, the Director of Student Aid, the Foreign Student Advisor, the Veterans Advisor, the Director of Educational Information, and the Assistant Director of Labor Education.

(3) Those members of the administrative staff who, by name have been elected by the Senate to such membership prior to the adoption of this amendment and those part-time members of the teaching staff who were given membership by the Constitution prior to the adoption of this amendment. Membership of this class is retained so long as the person holds the same position.

Clause 3. The Associate, or non-voting, membership shall consist of:

(1) All members of the faculty who are not included in the foregoing clause (such as, but not limited to, visiting faculty, holders of letters of appointment);

(2) Two representatives of the Student Body to be appointed by the Student Senate;

(3) All members of the administrative staff with annual contracts who are not included in Clause 2 above.

Clause 4. A committee on Membership shall be appointed by the Chairman of the Senate at the November meeting of the Senate. The Committee shall consist of six members, including a member of the teaching and/or research faculty from the College of Arts and Sciences, the Walter E. Heller College of Business Administration, the Chicago Musical College, and the College of Education, and one administrative regular voting member of the faculty (see Clause 2 above). This Committee shall:

(1) Examine the list of staff members with annual administrative contracts and recommend to the Senate additions, deletions, or no change in the list of administrative regular voting members in Clause 2 above;

(2) Make a similar recommendation concerning the list of ex-officio members of the Senate in ARTICLE III, SECTION 1, Clause 1 (1) below;

(3) Present these recommendations at the February meeting of the Senate for consideration and vote at the March meeting.

SECTION 3. General Provisions.

The members of the Teaching and Research Faculty shall carry out such academic policies as are determined by the University Senate and by their Departments, and shall carry out such administrative duties as are assigned to them by their Deans and their Chairmen. They shall also be held responsible for the maintenance of a high academic standard and for efficiency in their teaching.

ARTICLE II

OFFICERS OF THE FACULTY

SECTION 1. The President.

Clause 1. The President is elected by the Board of Trustees. His responsibilities are defined by the Bylaws of the Corporation as follows: "The President shall be the head of all sections of the University, exercising such supervision and direction as will promote their efficiency; he shall be responsible for the discipline of the University; he shall be present at the meetings of the University Senate; he shall be the official medium of communication between the Faculty and the Board, and between the students and the Board, except as herein otherwise provided; he shall recommend to the Board appointments to the Faculty; he shall be responsible for carrying out all measures officially agreed upon by the Board of Trustees."

Clause 2. The President shall request a vote of confidence from the Faculty each third year, counting from the year of his appointment.* The President may request a vote of confidence at his discretion and at any time.

Clause 3. The vote shall be by secret ballot and shall be marked "YES" for confidence and "NO" for non-confidence. An affirmative majority of the votes cast shall constitute an expression of confidence.

* See Addendum 4!

Clause 4. The purpose of this vote is to convey to the President, and through him to the Board, the sentiment of the University Faculty. It is expected that the President and the Board will respect the sentiment thus expressed. The results of this vote shall be reported to the Faculty not more than two weeks after the vote is taken.

SECTION 2. The Deans.

Clause 1. Each Dean shall be appointed by the Board of Trustees upon recommendation of the President. When a Dean of Faculties or Dean of Students is to be appointed, a committee elected by the University Senate shall aid in the search for candidates and advise the President in the selection. When a Dean of a College or of the Graduate Faculty is to be appointed, a committee elected by the appropriate College Council or the Graduate Faculty shall perform the same functions. Any of these committees must have representation from each College of the University.

Clause 2. The Deans shall implement and carry out within their respective divisions such academic policies as are determined by the University Senate and such administrative duties as are assigned to them by the President. In addition, they shall exercise leadership in the improvement of educational standards and practices within their respective spheres. All provisions in this Constitution relating to Deans shall apply equally to the following: the Dean of Faculties, the Dean of the Graduate Faculty, the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, the Dean of the Walter E. Heller College of Business Administration, the Dean of Students, the Dean of the Chicago Musical College, the Dean of the College of Continuing Education, the Dean of the College of Education, the Director of the Labor Education Division, and any additional supervisors of instruction who are declared by the President to perform dean's duties and whose appointment is subject to confirmation by the Board of Trustees.

Clause 3. The Dean of each College shall request a vote of confidence from the Faculty of his College within two years after assuming office and every three years thereafter.

The Dean of Faculties, the Dean of Students and the Dean of the College of Continuing Education shall each request a vote of confidence from the Faculty of the entire University within two years after assuming office and every three years thereafter.

The Dean of the Graduate Faculty shall request a vote of confidence from the Graduate Faculty within two years after assuming office and every three years thereafter.

Clause 4. The vote shall be by secret ballot and shall be marked "YES" for confidence and "NO" for non-confidence. An affirmative majority of the votes cast shall constitute an expression of confidence.

Clause 5. The purpose of this vote is to convey to the Deans, and through them to the President, for his guidance, the sentiment of the Faculty. The results of this vote shall be reported to the Faculty not more than two weeks after the vote is taken.

Clause 6. In votes of confidence for deans of individual Colleges, all voting members of the College involved shall have a vote. In votes of confidence for the President, the Dean of Faculties, and the Dean of Students, all voting members of the University Faculty shall have a vote. In votes of confidence for the Dean of the Graduate Faculty, all voting members of the Graduate Faculty shall have a vote.

Clause 7. Votes of confidence provided for in this Constitution shall be taken at the discretion of the person requesting the vote at any time between January 1, and May 31, previous to the expiration of the three-year periods set forth in Article II, Section 1, Clause 2, and Article II, Section 2, Clause 3.

SECTION 3. Chairmen of Departments.

Clause 1. The Dean of Faculties shall notify the full-time voting members of a Department in which the position of chairmanship is to be filled that they may submit nominations for the chairmanship to the Dean of their College. The Dean of the College shall consult with the members of the department and then poll the full-time voting members of the Department by secret ballot on these nominations. The Dean of the College shall then transmit the list of nominations and a report of the departmental poll, together with his recommendations, through the Dean of Faculties to the President. The President shall consult with the Dean of Faculties, the Dean of the College, and the Dean of the Graduate Division before appointing Departmental Chairmen. In case the Dean of the College recommends someone to be Department Chairman who has not received a majority of the votes cast by full-time members in the Department, the President shall consult with the Department before making the appointment. Appointments of Department Chairmen shall be reported to the Faculty of the appropriate College on or before the twenty-fifth of May. The President may appoint an Acting Chairman for a term not to exceed one year.

Clause 2. The term of office shall be three years. The appointment shall be made each third year in May, or, if a vacancy occurs before the expiration of the three-year term, as soon as possible after the vacancy occurs.

Clause 3. A chairmanship does not necessarily carry with it any change in rank or increase in salary. There shall, however, be made such adjustment in the teaching load of the Chairman as is necessary to enable him to devote adequate time to his administrative duties.

Clause 4. The Chairman of the various Departments shall implement and carry out within their respective Departments such academic policies as are determined by the University Senate and by their Departments, and such administrative duties as are assigned to them by their Deans. They shall also be held responsible for the maintenance of a high academic standard within their Departments.

Clause 5. The Chairman of every Department shall call a department meeting at least twice every semester. Other department meetings may be called by an appropriate administrative officer, and shall be called upon petition of two members of the Department.

ARTICLE III

LEGISLATIVE BODIES

SECTION 1. The University Senate.

Clause 1. The University Senate shall consist of ex-officio, elected regular, and associate members. All members shall have the right to vote, to speak, and to move actions. Associate members may not serve as officers of the Senate and may serve on committees only if expressly provided by Senate action.

(1) The ex-officio members shall be the President, the Deans, the Associate Dean of Admissions and Records, the Directors of non-credit Divisions, the Treasurer, the Director of Development, and the Head Librarian; and any person holding ex-officio membership at the time this amendment is adopted, who shall retain membership so long as he holds the same office. Changes in this list may be proposed by the Committee on Membership. (ARTICLE I, Section 2, Clause 4.)

(2) The elected regular members shall be those representatives of the teaching and/or research faculty who are elected under the formula prescribed in Clause 2 below; one representative of the library staff (other than the Head Librarian); one representative of the administrative voting members of the Faculty, and one representative of the administrative associate members of the Faculty (the last three each elected by the respective group).

(3) All holders of non-departmental chairs and members of unorganized departments of a College are to be considered a department of the College for the purpose of electing representatives to the Senate.

(4) The associate members shall be the associate student members of the Faculty. (See ARTICLE I, SECTION 2, Clause 3 (3).)

Clause 2. (1) As nearly as is practicable, the representation in the University Senate of the Teaching and/or Research Faculty of the University and of each College and of each Department is to bear the same relation to the total teaching load of the University, College, and Department respectively, as the representation of the Administrative Staff in the Senate does to the total work load of the Administrative Staff. However, each department of the University, having at least one full-time teacher, is to have at least one representative in the Senate; and proportionality of representation in the Department is to take precedence over proportionality in the Colleges and University.

(2) In time to notify the Departments by April 15 each year, the Dean of Faculties, using the data of the Spring Semester of that year, and the definitions and formula in the following paragraphs, is to calculate the number of senators that each Department is to elect.

(3) A unit-load, as applied to the Administrative Staff, is defined to be the work assigned by contract to a full-time member of the Administrative Staff. If a member is assigned less than a unit-load, his work is to be evaluated as that fractional part of the unit-load which is in fact assigned to him. The total work load of the Administrative Staff is the sum of the unit and fractional parts of units that have been assigned to all its members, including the work of the Librarian but not that of the remaining members of the Library staff.

(4) A unit-load, as applied to the members of the Teaching Staff, is defined to be the number of semester hours normally assigned to a full-time teacher in the Department in which he holds his appointment. If a member is assigned less than a unit-load his load is to be evaluated as that fractional part of a unit which is in fact assigned to him, including appropriate credit for administrative work assigned to him in lieu of teaching, but not for work done outside the University. The total teaching load of a Department is the sum of the units and fractional parts of units that have been assigned to all the members of the Department. The total teaching load of a College is the sum of the total teaching load of its Departments, and the total teaching load of the University is the sum of the total teaching loads of its Colleges.

(5) To find the number of Senators that a Department is to elect in May each year, the formula n:1=N:L is to be used, where N stands for the number of members of the Administrative Staff who are members of the Senate, 1 stands for the teaching load of the Department, L stands for the total work load of the Administrative Staff, and the resulting value of n is to be used as follows: if for k=1, 2, 3, . . . , n is more than k-1 and not more than k, k senators are to be elected from and by the members of the Department.

(6) The Librarians, exclusive of the Head Librarian, acting as a unit independent of the administrative staff and the academic departments, are to elect each year one of their members to represent them in the Senate. The administrative regular voting members of the faculty who are not members of the Library staff or of the Senate, acting as a unit, are to elect each year one of their members to represent them in the Senate. The administrative associate members of the faculty, acting as a unit, are to elect each year one of their members to represent them in the Senate. (See ARTICLE I, SECTION 2, Clause 2 (2) and (3) and Clause 3 (3).)

Clause 3. Elections to the University Senate shall take place during the first week of May each year. Voting may be by whatever method each electing unit shall adopt, provided that there shall be open nominations and secret ballots. Each regular voting member of the Faculty and Library Staff, but no ex-officio Senators, shall have one vote, and that in the electing unit in which he holds his appointment, and he shall be eligible for election as a representative of that unit.

Clause 4. The term of office of representatives elected to the University Senate shall be one year beginning October 1.

Clause 5. The University Senate shall elect each year at the regular October meeting a Chairman, a Vice-Chairman who shall act in the absence of the Chairman, and a Secretary. These officers shall serve until their successors are elected.

Clause 6. It shall be the duty of the University Senate to decide all matters that concern the University as a whole and that are not the exclusive province of the Board of Trustees, and all other matters not specifically delegated to the College Councils or to the Administration.

Clause 7. The University Senate shall at its regular May meeting elect for two successive years two members of the Faculty to the Board of Trustees, and for each third year three members of the Faculty to the Board of Trustees for terms of three years each, those elected taking office beginning with the next following annual meeting of the Board in place of those Faculty Trustees whose terms have expired. Not more than two of the Trustees elected by the University Senate and serving at the same time shall be full-time administrative officers. In these elections there shall be open nominations and a secret ballot. The candidates receiving the largest number of votes shall be declared elected. The Secretary of the University Senate shall, within five days after the election, inform the Secretary of the University Corporation of the result of the election.

Clause 8. The University Senate may, by a majority of those voting at any meeting, declare vacant any elective office of the University Senate, or any Faculty membership of the Board of Trustees, which is held by a person who has ceased to be a member of the Faculty, or who is unable for any reason to serve actively to the end of his term of office. When any elective office of the University is declared vacant, this vacancy shall be filled by an appropriate election at the next meeting.

SECTION 2. Legislative Procedures in the University Senate.

Clause 1. Regular meetings of the University Senate shall be held on the third Wednesday of every month from October to May, except that the Executive Committee of the University Senate may, by giving one week's advance written notice to all members, move the date of any given meeting forward or back as many as seven days. The President, in consultation with the Chairman of the University Senate and the Deans shall prepare the agenda for University Senate meetings and circulate the proposed agenda a week prior to meetings. The President may revise the agenda if new business of importance arises during the said week, and the University Senate may, by consent or majority vote, change the agenda, but in every case the agenda shall include the item of "new business".

Clause 2. Other meetings of the University Senate may be called by the President, by the Dean of Faculties, by the Executive Committee of the University Senate, or upon petition of one-fourth of the membership of the entire University Senate addressed to one of these three.

Clause 3. Notices of special meetings of the University Senate must be mailed to all members so that under reasonable conditions the notices will be received one week before the meeting is to be held.

Clause 4. At regular meetings of the University Senate a quorum shall consist of any number that is present. At special meetings a quorum shall consist of sixty per cent of the full-time voting members.

Clause 5. When not otherwise specified in this Constitution, a majority of the votes cast shall be sufficient to authorize any action of the University Senate.

SECTION 3. Committees of the University Senate.

Subsection 1. The Executive Committee

Clause 1. The Executive Committee shall be the principal committee serving the University Senate.

Clause 2. The Executive Committee shall consist of the President and the Dean of Faculties, both ex-officio, the Chairman of the Senate, ex-officio without vote, and seven members of the University Senate elected by the University Senate, and comprising

(1) one dean
(2) three department chairmen
(3) three members of the Teaching and/or Research Faculty

Among the seven elected members there shall be at least one representative from the College of Arts and Sciences, one from the Walter E. Heller College of Business Administration, one from the Chicago Musical College, and one from the College of Education.

Clause 3. The term of office of the Executive Committee members shall be one year, i.e., from the date in October on which they are elected by the Senate to the date in the following October on which their successors are elected. No elected member may serve for more than three consecutive terms.

Clause 4. The President shall each year in October call the first meeting of the Executive Committee. At this meeting the Executive Committee shall elect its own Chairman and Secretary, and these officers shall serve until their successors are elected.

Clause 5. Meetings of the Executive Committee may be called by the President or by the Chairman of the Executive Committee, or on petition by any three members of the Committee addressed to either of these officers.

Clause 6. The Executive Committee is charged by the University Senate as follows:

(1) It shall investigate, deliberate, and recommend on all questions referred to it by the University Senate.

(2) During the intervals between meetings of the University Senate, it shall make decisions for the Senate on routine questions and decide questions of general policy in emergencies. All decisions shall be reported to the University Senate.

(3) It shall advise the President on administrative questions which have academic implications.

(4) It shall review, before final severance is effected, cases of dismissal involving members of the Faculty on tenure.

Clause 7. The Executive Committee of the Senate shall constitute a board of elections to conduct all elections and votes of confirmation and confidence by the Senate and by the Faculty. It shall also hold referenda among the Faculty in regard to amendments to the Constitution as provided in Art. V, Sec. 2, Cl. 2.

Subsection 2. The Curriculum Committee

Clause 1. The Curriculum Committee of the University Senate shall consist of the following members:

(1) The President;
(2) the Deans;
(3) the Registrar;
(4) all Chairmen of Departments who are voting members of the Faculty; and
(5) one student elected by the Student Senate.

Clause 2. The Curriculum Committee shall elect its own Chairman and Secretary.

Clause 3. The Curriculum Committee may initiate and shall study and recommend to the Senate all changes pertaining to curricula which are not within the jurisdiction of any College Council, and shall review any curriculum actions of any College Council which may affect the interests of another College, and shall submit recommendations thereon to the Senate for final decision.

Clause 4. Any committee established by the Senate to supervise the curricula of programs other than those of the graduate division or the colleges of the University, but which involve, in whole or part, degree credit courses shall report to the Senate Curriculum Committee.

Any decision by such a committee on which there is a dissenting vote shall be subject to review by the Senate Curriculum Committee.

Subsection 3. The University Teacher Education Committee

Clause 1. The University Teacher Education Committee of the University Senate shall consist of the following members:

1. The Dean of Faculties
2. The Deans of the Colleges
3. The Dean or Associate Dean of the Graduate Division
4. The Associate Dean of Admissions and Records
5. One member elected from the faculty of the Walter E. Heller College of Business Administration, three members elected from the faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences (one from the natural sciences, one from the social sciences, one from the humanities), and two members elected from the College of Education.
6. Any department in the University may elect one of its members as a non-voting member of the Committee to serve in a liaison capacity.

Clause 2. The elected members of the University Teacher Education Committee shall be elected by the affected College Councils at their first meeting of the academic year.

Clause 3. The University Teacher Education Committee shall elect its own Chairman and Secretary.

Clause 4. Meetings of the University Teacher Education Committee may be called by the Chairman of the Committee, by any of the deans, or by request from the University Senate, but shall meet at least once each semester.

Clause 5. The University Teacher Education Committee shall serve as a review committee for all proposed changes in undergraduate curricula in Teacher Education, and shall make recommendations to the Curriculum Committee of the University Senate. No change in these curricula may be made, except by action of the Curriculum Committee of the University Senate and approval of the Senate.

It shall also serve as the central body in the University for the study and development of policies for teacher education and for liaison among the Colleges and their departments in matters affecting teacher education, in the spirit of the 1969 statement "Functions of the University Teacher Education Committee."

Subsection 4. Notification of Committee Appointments

The Secretary of the University Senate shall append to the minutes of each Senate meeting a list of all committees and their members appointed since the preceding Senate meeting.

SECTION 4. The College Councils.

Clause 1. The College of Arts and Sciences, the Walter E. Heller College of Business Administration, the Chicago Musical College, and the College of Education shall each have a Council, which shall consist of the President, the Dean of Faculties, the Associate Dean for Admissions and Records, and the regular voting faculty and the Dean of the College.** Other staff members may participate in the meetings of the College Council, but they shall not have the right to vote.

Clause 2. It shall be the duty of each College Council to determine policies with regard to College academic matters, including the objectives and content of particular curricula; the improvement of instruction; the grading system; the academic advising of students; requirements for degrees and certificates; course load; student assemblies and programs; scholarships and grants-in-aid; and the orientation of new students and of new staff members; provided that all decisions shall be subject to ratification by the University Senate when they involve the interests of any other College or of the University as a whole.

Clause 3. Each College Council shall elect at the first regular meeting of the school year an Executive Committee of not less than five nor more than ten members. The Dean of the College shall be a member of this Executive Committee ex-officio. *

* See Addendum #1

** See Addendum #2 and #3 ([illegible])

Clause 4. The Executive Committee of each College Council shall make recommendations to the President regarding promotions and the granting of tenure. It shall also constitute a board of elections to conduct all elections and votes of confirmation and confidence held by its College Council and by the Faculty of its College, and to receive recommendations for departmental chairmen.*

Clause 5. The College of Continuing Education will have a Council with the duties provided in Clauses 2, 3 and 4 above. It shall be composed of twelve members elected by the College Councils, to include two from the Walter E. Heller College of Business Administration; two from the Chicago Musical College; six from the College of Arts and Sciences divided as follows: two from the natural sciences, two from the social sciences, two from the humanities; two from the College of Education; and shall also include all full-time faculty of the College of Continuing Education and two BGS students to be elected according to a procedure to be established by the Council. The President, the Dean of Faculties, Dean of each College, Director of Labor Education and the Registrar shall be members ex-officio. The Council will annually elect a chairman from its membership. Any decision by this Council on curriculum matters on which there is a dissenting vote shall be subject to review by the Senate Curriculum Committee.

SECTION 5. The Graduate Council.

Clause 1. In the first week of May, the members of the Graduate Faculty in each department offering graduate work leading to an advanced degree shall elect one member to serve on the Graduate Council for a term of one year. The following members of the Administrative Staff shall be voting members of the Graduate Council:

(1) the President,
(2) the Dean of Faculties,
(3) the Dean of the Graduate Faculty, and
(4) the Dean of each College.

The Associate Dean of Admissions and Records and the Registrar shall be non-voting members of the Council.

Clause 2. The Graduate Council shall at its first meeting during the academic year elect its own Chairman and Secretary, and shall meet at least once each semester at the call of the President, the Dean of Faculties, the Dean of the Graduate Faculty, or the Chairman, or on petition of one-half of its elected members addressed to any of these officers.

* See Addendum II

Clause 3. The Graduate Council shall decide all matters pertaining to the admission to graduate study; general requirements for advanced degrees; the approval of courses open only to graduate students; and with respect to graduate studies, policies regarding the award of scholarships; the improvement of instruction, the grading system; course load; and the system of academic advising. The minutes of the Graduate Council shall be circulated among all members of the University Faculty. Any policy decision made by the Council may be appealed to the Senate by any member of the Graduate Council or of the Senate within two academic weeks following the circulation of minutes.

SECTION 6. General Regulations for Legislative Bodies.

Clause 1. All elected officers and committee members of the University Senate and of the College Councils shall take office on the day of their election or at such other time as may be specified by the Constitution and shall remain in office until their successors are elected.

Clause 2. It shall be the duty of each member of the University Senate, of a College Council, or of the Graduate Council to attend all meetings of each body of which he is a member.

Clause 3. Every regular or associate member of the University Faculty has the right to attend any meeting of the University Senate and of his College Council, to request the privilege of participating in discussion, and to inspect the minutes of the University Senate and of the College Councils.

Clause 4. All elections, unless otherwise provided for in this Constitution, shall be held with secret preferential ballot.

Clause 5. All questions of parlimentary procedure not covered by this Constitution shall be referred for decision to Robert's Rules of Order.

ARTICLE IV

GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE

SECTION 1. Purpose.

In any large organization differences of opinion are to be expected from time to time. Opinions may differ on questions of policy. Such questions are properly settled by majority vote of the proper legislative body. On the other hand, there may be non-legislative differences of opinion. This article is intended to provide an orderly way of resolving serious differences of opinion regarding duties and application of policies and of contracts. Recognizing that disagreements may be more apparent than real, this article provides both a means of determining the seriousness of the dispute and a means for arbitrating important disputes.

SECTION 2. Applicability of Grievance Procedure.

The several procedures included under grievance procedure are available for any full-time member or members of the Faculty or Administrative Staff.

SECTION 3. Informal Procedure for Minor Grievances.

Clause 1. In the event of a non-legislative difference of opinion involving a member or members of the Faculty or Administrative Staff, any of the principals or their superior officers may request an informal discussion of the matter to be conducted by the Dean, the Administrative Council, the Executive Committee of the Senate, or the President, whichever is the lowest-ranking person or body having supervision over the principals. The request shall be written, signed and filed in duplicate, one copy going to the President and the other copy going to the officer or body qualified to hear the matter. The request shall state the reason for filing the request and shall name the person or persons involved in the difference of opinion.

Clause 2. The President shall himself or through the appropriate officer send to the persons named in the request a copy of the request for a discussion.

Clause 3. The appropriate officer shall set a time and place for the discussion and shall act as chairman of the meeting so arranged. The President shall determine who is the appropriate officer, in case of doubt.

Clause 4. Discussion shall be informal, and each person present may file with the President and with all concerned his own record of the discussion, but the only record that is mandatory is a report by the chairman of the meeting, who shall report to the President that discussion was held, naming the parties present and giving his opinion as to whether a serious disagreement existed at the conclusion of the meeting.

SECTION 4. Formal Procedure for Major Grievances.

Clause 1. If, in the opinion of any of the principals, the grievance has not been resolved, any of the principals may file a request for a formal hearing. This request must be filed not later than one week after the informal discussion referred to in Section 3, Clause 4, or, in the absence of an informal discussion, not later than one month after the filing of a request in accordance with Section 3, Clause 1. The person filing the request shall send two copies to the President and one copy to the lowest ranking officer having jurisdiction. This request shall specify the subject of the dispute.

Clause 2. The President shall send a copy of the request to all persons against whom the grievance is filed.

Clause 3. The lowest ranking officer having jurisdiction shall notify the parties of the time and place of the hearing and arrange for the taking of a verbatim report, giving at least one week's notice to all concerned. This hearing must be held within two calendar months following the date on which the request for a formal hearing is filed. This time limit may be extended two calendar months on request of either party, and longer by unanimous consent of the parties.

Clause 4. The hearing officer shall make a finding of fact and recommend a settlement, sending a copy thereof to each party and to the President.

Clause 5. If one or more of the parties to the dispute is not willing to accept the recommendation of the hearing officer, he has the right to notify the President that he intends to appeal the decision, provided this notification is given within thirty days after the mailing of the hearing officer's report.

Clause 6. On appeal, the matter shall be successively considered by the Dean of Faculties, the Executive Committee of the Senate, and the Board of Trustees or its appointed representative, providing the appeal to the Board of Trustees shall be filed not less than three months after the date of the original formal hearing, and not more than three months after the President has been notified. Appeal to the Board of Trustees may be made regardless of preliminary stages if an amicable settlement has not been reached within eight months after the date of the original formal hearing. The Board of Trustees reserves the right to determine whether it will consider the matter.

Clause 7. The officer or the body to which appeal is made is not required to conduct a hearing, but may render an opinion based upon the previous record, provided that each party is accorded the right to file one statement including new evidence and/or depositions from new witnesses and to receive and reply to any statement filed by the other party. If there is a hearing on appeal, the parties shall be given at least one week's notice of the time and place.

Clause 8. When a grievance comes to the Executive Committee of the Senate, the hearing, if any, the finding, and the recommendation shall be entrusted to a panel of the Executive Committee, from which panel the following shall be excluded: The President, any Dean who has already heard the case, any party to the dispute, and anyone who by majority vote of the Executive Committee is disqualified because of interest or expressed bias. If a qualified panel cannot be secured by this means, vacancies on the panel shall be filled by selecting by lot members of the Executive Committees of the College Councils.

Clause 9. All parties filing a grievance, and all parties against whom a grievance is filed, shall have the right to attend and to be heard at all hearings.

Clause 10. While a grievance is in process, all concerned have an obligation to refrain from inciting others to partisanship. It is improper for parties to a grievance to communicate on the subject of the grievance with persons hearing or about to hear the grievance, except by written statements which are also communicated to all other parties to the grievance.

Clause 11. Persons not named in a grievance may join in it as parties if in the judgment of the hearing officer or body they show good cause.

Clause 12. In the original formal hearing, no party shall have the right to bring legal counsel to the meeting unless the dispute arises out of dismissal for cause. .

Clause 13. On appeal any party may bring legal counsel or a colleague who will serve as advisor at any hearing that may be held.

Clause 14. If legal counsel is desired at any hearing, the President and the other parties must be notified of such intention at least twenty-four hours prior to the time of the hearing.

Clause 15. Legal counsel shall limit his participation in a hearing to advising his client and supplying information. Legal counsel shall not be permitted to engage in extended argument.

Clause 16. Parties have the right to call witnesses in any hearing. Legal counsel, if present at the hearing, shall not have the right to cross-examine witnesses, but parties to the dispute may cross-examine witnesses.

Clause 17. The rules of law courts cannot be claimed as rights by parties to the dispute, but those who conduct hearings may make such rulings as they regard as reasonable in a given case.

Clause 18. Verbatim reports of hearings, findings, and recommendations shall be filed promptly with the President. Parties shall have the right to read the verbatim reports in a place designated by the President, but except by unanimous consent of all concerned, no one but the President shall have possession of the verbatim reports.

Clause 19. Any voting member of the Faculty may inspect the request for grievance in the President's office and may be informed as to the stage which the grievance has reached. When a grievance file has been closed, the President shall report to the Faculty in his Newsletter or by other communication that it has been closed, but the release of further information shall be at his discretion, except that nothing in this clause shall be interpreted as invalidating Clause 18. None of the documents of dispute shall be released until the grievance has been settled or has run its full course.

Clause 20. Officers and bodies hearing formal grievances shall record in their next annual reports the fact that grievances were filed and heard, naming the parties and stating whether an amicable settlement was reached; but no details need be published.

Clause 21. This article shall not preclude the possibility of direct executive action, but such action shall not stop the grievance procedure for purposes of review.

Clause 22. Appeal to a court or outside agency to redress the grievance forfeits the right of any aggrieved party to further use of this grievance machinery.

ARTICLE V

TENURE RULES

SECTION 1. Teaching or research faculty appointments shall be either tenured, probationary, extended service, visiting or part-time. Probationary and tenured faculty shall be referred to as tenure-line faculty. Visiting, part-time, and extended service appointments shall not have tenure rights nor shall such service count toward tenure.

SECTION 2. Tenure rights of full-time members of the teaching and/or research faculty:

Clause 1. Professors, Associate Professors, and Assistant Professors. To be given an initial probationary contract for three years. At the end of the second year, appointee to be told that he will be given an additional three-year contract or that this contract will not be renewed. At the end of the second year of the second contract, appointee to be told that he has been given indefinite tenure (during competence) or that his contract will not be renewed at its expiration.

Clause 2. Instructors. Six one-year contracts. Written notice by the end of six months, in each of the first four years, necessary for reappointment. By the end of the fifth year, appointee to be told that he will be advanced to the rank of Assistant Professor at the end of his sixth year and given indefinite tenure (during competence) or that his contract will not be renewed. The Executive Committee of the Faculty shall be empowered to make necessary exceptions to the procedure provided for in this section.

Clause 3. All ranks. Before a tenure-line member of the Faculty is told whether he will receive indefinite tenure, his department and the Executive Committee of the Faculty shall file their recommendations. The Department's recommendation shall be determined by a secret ballot of the full-time voting members of the Department, except the candidate for indefinite tenure, and the tally shall be incorporated in the Department minutes. The Department's recommendation shall be filed with the appropriate Dean, with the Executive Committee of the Faculty, and with the President. In the meeting of the Executive Committee the Dean or the Director of the College in which the candidate for indefinite tenure teaches shall have one vote.* The Dean of Faculties shall have the right to attend this meeting but shall not have a vote. The President shall consider these recommendations before he notifies the faculty member whether or not he will receive indefinite tenure.

SECTION 3. Special applications of Tenure Rules.

Clause 1. ** (new) During a probationary period, at any rank, the appointee shall have no recourse to grievance procedure if his contract is not renewed at expiration, provided due advance notice of termination has been given. Neither the administration nor the Department Chairman shall need to give reasons for non-reappointment.

** Clause 2., 3., 4. (new)

Clause ~~2~~. 5 Indefinite tenure is understood to be contingent upon adequate and efficient performance of duties assigned to the faculty member, such duties to be those customarily regarded as academic. The burden of proof of inefficiency is to be on the administration and the Department Chairman if the faculty member is not a Department Chairman; otherwise, the burden of proof is to be on the administration only. Indefinite tenure means a right to keep the rank and salary held at the time when indefinite tenure was acquired or any rank and salary acquired at a later date. A reduction in salary can only take place in case of a general salary reduction necessitated by financial stringency and covering all faculty members, or all faculty members of a college or of a certain rank. The salary referred to herein means the amount of salary within the regular established ranges.

Clause ~~3~~. 6 Tenure shall not mean the right to teach certain courses or to teach in a given department. If a teaching and/or research faculty member is transferred, however, the reasonableness and necessity of the transfer may be questioned through the grievance procedure.

Clause ~~4~~. 7 Leave of absence on pay shall extend a contract by the amount of time on leave.

Clause ~~5~~. 8 Promotions and increases in salary occurring before the termination of a contract period shall be recognized by issuance of a new contract which shall have the same terminal date as the

* See Addendum # 1

** [illegible]

contract then in force. It is understood that promotion to a higher rank gives the appointee the probationary status of the higher rank. Time served in a lower rank shall be counted toward fulfillment of the probationary requirement of the higher rank to which the faculty member is promoted.

Clause ~~6~~.9 In cases of removal for cause, before the expiration of a contract period, the President or the Dean of Faculties may suspend immediately. If suspension is not made the subject of grievance procedure within 30 days, the appointment may be terminated by the President.

Clause ~~7~~. 10 Administrative positions are excluded from these rules of tenure, but faculty members retain tenure rights as teachers when relieved of administrative duties qua Department Chairmen and advisors. A faculty member retains tenure rights when appointed to a deanship or other full-time administrative position, and upon termination of his administrative appointment, his rights to a teaching position in his department are fully reinstated.

* SECTION 4. (new)

SECTION ~~4~~.5 Definitions of Part-time and Full-time.

The words "part-time" and "full-time" are employed in the tenure rules to refer to the distinction which has been made in practice since the founding of the University. Amount of teaching load and rank do not necessarily indicate whether the person is a full-time or a part-time faculty member under the tenure rules. There are a few part-time faculty members who have been assigned one of the four conventional ranks. It also happens that from time to time "part-time" faculty members carry a full teaching load, whereas "full-time" faculty members may carry less than the normal load in their department. "Full-time" faculty members are those whose appointment is formalized by a contract signed by the President and by the faculty member, whose duties are primarily not administrative and whose tenure is clearly indicated at the top of the contract.

SECTION ~~5~~. 6 When new members are appointed to the Roosevelt University faculty, they may be given tenure or service-credits towards tenure for service at another institution, as if that service had been rendered at Roosevelt University. Such service credit, however, if it is granted, must be granted in accordance with the tenure rules of Roosevelt University not those of another university, and full tenure must be granted only in accordance with the provisions of Article V, Section 2, Clause 3 of this Constitution.

[illegible]

ARTICLE VI

AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION

Clause 1. Any proposed amendment to the Constitution may be presented at any meeting of the University Senate, and shall be considered at the next regular meeting, provided that there be at least one week between the two meetings.

Clause 2. Amendments to the Constitution shall be declared passed and shall be referred to the Board of Trustees for ratification, if they receive at least 70 per cent of all votes cast in the University Senate.

Clause 3. Whenever 30 per cent or more of the members of the University Senate or 50 per cent or more of those voting, but in either case less than 70 per cent of those voting, vote in favor of a proposed amendment, the Executive Committee of the Senate shall conduct a referendum among all the voting members of the Faculty within thirty days after the University Senate's action. The text of the proposed amendment and a ballot shall be mailed to each voting member of the Faculty with instructions to return the ballot to a designated place in the University building not more than ten days after the mailing of the ballot. If, in this referendum, the proposed amendment received a majority of the votes cast, it shall have the same status as amendments passed by the Senate and shall be referred to the Board of Trustees for ratification.

ARTICLE VII

ENACTING ARTICLE

The effective date of this Constitution is November 3, 1945, the date on which it was ratified by a majority of those present at a Faculty meeting called for the purpose.

Addendum #1

ROOSEVELT UNIVERSITY MEMORANDUM

April 19, 1974

TO: The Board of Trustees

FROM: Daniel H. Perlman, Secretary

RE: Proposed Amendments to the Constitution of the Faculty of Roosevelt University

At its meeting on April 17, the Roosevelt University Faculty Senate passed two amendments to the Faculty Constitution. In accordance with the procedure specified in the University Bylaws, these amendments are herewith presented to the Board of Trustees for ratification. Material to be deleted is included in brackets. Proposed additional material is underlined.

Amendment 1

Article II, Section 1, Clause 2.

(p. 3 of Constitution)

The President shall request a vote of confidence from the Faculty each third year, counting from the year of his appointment [.] (see Article II, Section 2, Clause 7). The President may request a vote of confidence at his discretion and at any time.

Amendment 2

Article III, Section 4, Clause 3.

(p. 13)

Each College Council shall elect at the first regular meeting of the school year an Executive Committee of not less than five nor more than ten members. The Dean of the College shall be a member of this Executive Committee ex-officio [.] with vote, except on matters of promotion and tenure.

Article V, Section 2, Clause 3.

(p. 21)

...In the meeting of the Executive Committee the Dean or the Director of the College in which the candidate for indefinite tenure teaches shall have one vote [.] except in matters of promotion and tenure.

Addendum #2

ROOSEVELT UNIVERSITY MEMORANDUM

October 11, 1974

TO: Roosevelt University Board of Trustees

FROM: Daniel H. Perlman, Secretary

RE: Amendment to the Faculty Constitution

At its meeting on May 15, 1974, the Roosevelt University Senate voted to amend the Faculty Constitution to include a representative of the library staff as a voting member of the Council of the College of Arts and Sciences. This amendment, in context, is indicated below. [addition underlined]

Article III,
SECTION 4. Clause 1

(pg. 13)

The College of Arts and Sciences, the Walter E. Heller College of Business Administration, the Chicago Musical College, and the College of Education shall each have a Council, which shall consist of the President, the Dean of Faculties, the Associate Dean for Admissions and Records, and the regular voting faculty and the Dean of the College. A member of the library staff shall be elected by the library staff to be a member, with vote, of the Council of the College of Arts and Sciences. Other staff members may participate in the meetings of the College Councils, but they shall not have the right to vote.

In accordance with the provisions of the University Bylaws, amendments to the Faculty Constitution require ratification by the Board of Trustees before they are adopted.

Addendum #1: 3

ROOSEVELT UNIVERSITY MEMORANDUM

TO: The Board of Trustees

FROM: Daniel H. Perlman, Secretary D.H.P.

RE: Proposed Revision of Article V of the Faculty Constitution to Provide for an Appeal Process in Cases of Denial of Tenure

The following amendment to the Faculty Constitution [Section G of the Roosevelt University Board of Trustees Manual] was approved by the Faculty Senate at its meeting on December 18, 1974. It is being submitted to the Board of Trustees for ratification.

Amend Article V, Section 3 to read as follows:

Clause 1

(p. 21) Except as provided in Article V, Section 3, Clauses 3 and 4, during a probationary period, at any rank, the appointee shall have no recourse to an appeal procedure if his contract is not renewed at expiration provided due advance notice of termination has been given.

Clause 2

(p. 21) Neither the administration nor the department chairman shall be required to provide reasons for non-reappointment. Nor shall they be required to provide reasons for denial of tenure except upon specific written request of the faculty member denied tenure. The administration shall reply to such requests in writing.

Clause 3

(p. 21) If a faculty member who is denied indefinite tenure alleges that considerations violative of his academic freedom led to the decision not to grant him indefinite tenure, he may, within six months after receiving notice of denial, request the allegation be considered by the Faculty Tenure Review Committee which is established by Article V, Section 4. The allegation must be accompanied by a written statement from the faculty member agreeing to permit disclosure to any of the bodies hearing the grievance of such reasons and evidence as the administration may introduce in support of its decisions. The phrase "academic freedom" shall be defined as follows: (a) The faculty member is entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results, subject to adequate performance of his other duties; but research for pecuniary return should be based upon an understanding with the administration. (b) The faculty member shall have the right to discuss his subject in the classroom with full freedom. (c) When a faculty member speaks or writes as a citizen he should be free from institutional censorship or discipline. The Faculty Tenure Review Committee will seek to settle the matter by informal methods within thirty days of receipt of the allegation. If the matter remains unresolved after thirty days, and if the Faculty Tenure Review Committee so recommends, the matter will be referred to the Senate Executive Committee which shall sit as an advisory hearing body. When sitting as the hearing body in a tenure review case involving academic freedom, the Senate Executive Committee shall follow the procedures set forth in Clauses 8 through 22 of Article IV, Section 4. The faculty member bringing the allegation before the hearing body must state the grounds on which he bases the allegation, and the burden of proof shall rest on him. If, in the judgment of the hearing body, the faculty member succeeds in establishing a prima facie case that considerations violative of academic freedom led to the denial of tenure, it will be incumbent upon those who made the decision to deny him tenure to present evidence to the hearing body in support of their decision. The hearing body will provide a statement of its findings and recommendations to the faculty member and to the President.

Clause 4

(p. 21)

If a faculty member denied indefinite tenure alleges that the decision against tenure was based on inadequate consideration of his relevant qualifications, he may, within six months after receiving notice of non-reappointment, petition for a review by the Faculty Tenure Review Committee. Consideration would be judged adequate if the deliberations were conscientious and were directed toward the examination of evidence in the light of relevant standards. The Faculty Tenure Review Committee shall, within thirty days of receipt of the allegation, determine whether the decision was the result of adequate consideration of the relevant standards of Roosevelt University as applied to the faculty member. The Review Committee shall not substitute its judgment on the merits for that of the appropriate faculty bodies. The Review Committee will provide a statement of its findings to the faculty member, the college Executive Committee and the President. If the Review Committee believes that inadequate consideration was a factor in the denial of tenure, it will request reconsideration by the appropriate college Executive Committee. Upon reconsideration, the Executive Committee will make its recommendations to the President.

Add new Article V, Section 4

(p. 22)

The Faculty Tenure Review Committee shall consist of seven (7) tenured members of the teaching and/or research faculty elected by the University Senate at its February meeting for two-year terms, except that at its first meeting following ratification of this amendment by the Board of Trustees the University Senate shall elect four such members to two-year terms and three to one-year terms. No person may serve more than two consecutive terms. The Committee shall have at least one representative from each of the colleges, and shall exclude all deans. In those cases where a college has fewer than three tenured members, a non-tenured member shall be eligible. When meeting to review any specific tenure decision, the Committee shall exclude any of its members who were party to the initial decision. After its election, the Committee will be convened by the Chairman of the University Senate and shall elect its own chairman and secretary and establish rules of procedure subject to the approval of the Senate.

Present Article V, Section 3

p. 21

Clause 2 becomes Clause 5

Clause 3 becomes Clause 6

Clause 4 becomes Clause 7

Clause 5 becomes Clause 8

p. 22

Clause 6 becomes Clause 9

Clause 7 becomes Clause 10

Present Article V, Section 4 becomes Section 5

Present Article V, Section 5 becomes Section 6

Addendum #4

ROOSEVELT UNIVERSITY MEMORANDUM

February 5, 1975

TO: Roosevelt University Board of Trustees

FROM: Daniel H. Perlman, Secretary DHP

RE: Amendment to the Faculty Constitution

At its meeting on January 15, 1975, the Roosevelt University Senate voted to amend the Faculty Constitution to include a representative of the College of Continuing Education teaching faculty as a voting member of the Council of the College of Arts and Sciences. This amendment, in context, is indicated below. [addition underlined]

ARTICLE III.
SECTION 4. Clause 1

(p. 13)

The College of Arts and Sciences, the Walter E. Heller College of Business Administration, the Chicago Musical College, and the College of Education shall each have a Council, which shall consist of the President, the Dean of Faculties, the Associate Dean for Admissions and Records, and the regular voting faculty and the Dean of the College. One elected representative of the College of Continuing Education teaching faculty may participate in meetings of the Arts and Sciences Council, and that representative shall have the right to vote. A member of the library staff shall be elected by the library staff to be a member, with vote, of the Council of the College of Arts and Sciences. Other staff members may participate in the meetings of the College Councils, but they shall not have the right to vote.

In accordance with the provisions of the University Bylaws, amendments to the Faculty Constitution require ratification by the Board of Trustees before they are adopted.

Addendum #5

ROOSEVELT UNIVERSITY MEMORANDUM

September 23, 1975

TO: Roosevelt University Board of Trustees

FROM: Daniel H. Perlman, Secretary

RE: Proposed Amendment to the Constitution of the Faculty

The procedure for the selection of Department Chairmen is specified in Article II, Section 3, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the Faculty. Nowhere in the clause is reference made to the Executive Committee of the Colleges. However, in Article III, Section 4, Clause 4, it is specified that an Executive Committee is "to receive recommendations for departmental chairmen."

(p.14) It is proposed that this inconsistency be removed by deleting "and to receive recommendations for departmental chairmen" from Article III, Section 4, Clause 4.

This proposed amendment to the Constitution was approved by the Faculty Senate at its meeting on April 16, 1975, and it is being submitted to the Board of Trustees for ratification.

BYLAWS OF ROOSEVELT UNIVERSITY

(Including Amendments Adopted to October, 1972)

ARTICLE I

PURPOSES

The purposes of the corporation as stated in its certificate of incorporation are:

> To establish and maintain a university at Chicago, Illinois for the instruction of students in the liberal arts and in scientific, technical, and vocational subjects;
>
> To provide a teaching faculty for such university which shall be both free and responsible in the discovery and dissemination of truth; and
>
> To provide educational opportunities to persons of both sexes and of the various races on equal terms.

The corporation also has such powers as are now or may hereafter be granted by the General Not For Profit Corporation Act of the State of Illinois.

ARTICLE II

OFFICES

The corporation shall have and continuously maintain in this state a registered office and a registered agent whose office is identical with such registered office, and may have other offices within or without the State of Illinois as the Board of Trustees may from time to time determine.

ARTICLE III

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

SECTION 1. General Powers.

The affairs of the corporation shall be managed by its Board of Trustees, which may also be known as the Board of Directors.

SECTION 2. Number.

The Board of Trustees shall consist of a maximum of forty-seven voting members, forty-six of whom shall be elected as provided in Section 3 of this article, and the president of the corporation.

SECTION 3. Election.

At each annual meeting of the Board of Trustees, including that held in October, 1972, the Board of Trustees may elect as many as thirteen trustees. At its regular May meeting the Senate of the Faculty of the University shall elect for two successive years two trustees and for each third year, and beginning with 1962, three trustees for terms beginning with the next following annual meeting of the Board.

SECTION 4. Term of Office.

The term of office of each trustee shall be three years.

SECTION 5. Regular Meetings.

A regular meeting of the Board of Trustees shall be held without other notice than by Bylaw at 2 p.m., on the fourth Thursday of October in the offices of the University unless by prior notice the annual meeting is called and held on some other date in September or October. The Board of Trustees may provide by resolution the time and place either within or without the State of Illinois for the holding of additional regular meetings of the Board without other notice than such resolution.

SECTION 6. Special Meetings.

Special meetings of the Board of Trustees may be called by or at the request of the president or any two trustees. The person or persons authorized to call special meetings of the Board may fix any place, either within or without the State of Illinois, as the place for holding any special meeting of the Board called by them.

SECTION 7. Notice.

Notice of any special meeting of the Board of Trustees shall be given at least two days previously thereto by written notice delivered personally or sent by mail or telegram to each trustee at his address as shown by the records of the corporation. If mailed such notice shall be deemed to be delivered when deposited in the United States mail in a sealed envelope so addressed with postage thereon prepaid. If notice be given by telegram such notice shall be deemed to be delivered when the telegram is delivered to the telegraph company. Any trustee may waive notice of any meeting. The attendance of a trustee at any meeting shall constitute a waiver of notice of any such meeting except where a trustee attends a meeting for the express purpose of objecting to the transaction of any business because the meeting is not lawfully called or convened. Neither the business to be transacted at, nor the purpose of, any regular or special meeting of the Board need be specified in the notice or waiver of notice of such meeting, unless specifically required by law or by these Bylaws.

SECTION 8. Quorum.

A majority of the Board of Trustees shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business at any meeting of the Board, provided that if less than a majority of the trustees are present at said meeting, a majority of the trustees present may adjourn the meeting from time to time without further notice.

SECTION 9. Manner of Acting.

The act of a majority of the trustees present at a meeting at which a quorum is present shall be the act of the Board of Trustees, except where otherwise provided by law or by these Bylaws.

SECTION 10. Vacancies.

Any vacancy occuring in the Board of Trustees shall be filled by the Board of Trustees, if the vacating trustee was elected by the Board, or by the Faculty if the vacating trustee was elected by the Faculty. A trustee elected to fill a vacancy shall be elected for the unexpired term of his predecessor in office. During such time as any vacancy or vacancies shall exist in the Board of Trustees, the trustees who are in office shall have and exercise all of the powers given to the Board of Trustees by and under the laws of the State of Illinois and these Bylaws.

SECTION 11. Honorary Trustee.

The Board of Trustees may elect meritorious individuals to the category of Honorary Trustee. Board members who have given unusual service to the University over a period of years may be considered for this designation. An Honorary Trustee may attend all meetings of the Board of Trustees, without vote, and may attend commencements and other University ceremonies.

ARTICLE IV

OFFICERS

SECTION 1. Officers.

The officers of the corporation shall be a president, one or more vice presidents (the number thereof to be determined by the Board of Trustees), a treasurer, a secretary, and such other officers as may be elected in accordance with the provisions of this article. The Board of Trustees may elect or appoint such other officers, including one or more assistant secretaries and one or more assistant treasurers, as it shall deem desirable, such officers to have the authority and perform the duties prescribed from time to time, by the Board of Trustees. Any two or more offices may be held by the same person, except the office of president and secretary.

SECTION 2. Election and Term of Office.

The officers of the corporation shall be elected by the Board of Trustees for a term of one year. Vacancies may be filled or new offices created and filled at any meeting of the Board of Trustees. Each officer shall hold office until his successor shall have been duly elected and shall have qualified.

SECTION 3. Removal.

Any officer or agent elected or appointed by the Board of Trustees may be removed by the Board of Trustees whenever in its judgment the best interests of the corporation would be served thereby, but such removal shall be without prejudice to the contract rights, if any, of the person so removed.

SECTION 4. Vacancies.

A vacancy in any office because of death, resignation, removal, disqualification, or otherwise, may be filled by the Board of Trustees for the unexpired portion of the term.

SECTION 5. President.

a. The president shall be the principal executive officer of the corporation and shall in general supervise and control all of the business and affairs of the corporation. He shall be an ex officio member of the Board of Trustees.

b. The president shall be the head of all sections of the University, exercising such supervision and direction as will promote their efficiency; he shall be responsible for the discipline of the University; he shall be present at meetings of the Faculty; he shall be the official medium of communication between the Faculty and the Board, and between the students and the Board, except as herein otherwise provided; he shall be responsible for carrying out all measures officially agreed upon by the Board of Trustees.

c. The president shall make an annual report to the Board of Trustees concerning the work and condition of the University.

d. The president may sign, with the secretary or any other proper officer of the corporation authorized by the Board of Trustees, any deed, mortgages, bonds, contracts, or other instruments which the Board of Trustees has authorized to be executed, except in cases where the signing and execution thereof shall be expressly delegated by the Board of Trustees or by these Bylaws or by statute to some other officer or agent of the corporation; and in general shall perform all duties incident to the office of president and such other duties as may be prescribed by the Board of Trustees from time to time.

e. The president shall have the power to appoint qualified persons to positions on the teaching staff of the University and to enter into contracts with such appointees, provided that (1) he shall first have consulted with the dean of the school and the chairman and regular members of the department in which such an appointment is made; and (2) that the salaries for the positions to which such appointments are made have been covered by an authorized budget. The president, however, shall have no power to appoint a person to the office or duties of controller, director of the office of development, dean, acting dean, or vice president, but the president shall make recommendations to the Board of Trustees for appointments to said offices.

SECTION 6. Vice President.

In the absence of the president or in the event of his inability or refusal to act, the vice president (or in the event there be more than one vice president, the vice presidents in the order of their election) shall perform the duties of the president, and when so acting, shall have all the powers of and be subject to all the restrictions upon the president. Any vice president shall perform such other duties as from time to time may be assigned to him by the president or by the Board of Trustees.

SECTION 7. Treasurer.

If required by the Board of Trustees, the treasurer shall give a bond for the faithful discharge of his duties in such sum and with such surety or sureties as the Board of Trustees shall determine. He shall have charge and custody of and be responsible for all funds and securities of the corporation; receive and give receipts for monies due and payable to the corporation from any source whatsoever, and deposit all such monies in the name of the corporation in such banks, trust companies, or other depositaries as shall be selected in accordance with the provisions of Article VII of these Bylaws; and in general perform all the duties incident to the office of treasurer and such other duties as from time to time may be assigned to him by the president or by the Board of Trustees.

SECTION 8. Secretary.

The secretary shall keep the minutes of the meetings of the Board of Trustees in one or more books provided for that purpose; see that all notices are duly given in accordance with the provisions of these bylaws or as required by law; be custodian of the corporate records and of the seal of the corporation and see that the seal of the corporation is affixed to all documents, the execution of which on behalf of the corporation under its seal is duly authorized in accordance with the provisions of these bylaws; keep a register of the post office address of each member, which shall be furnished to the secretary by such members; and in general perform all duties incident to the office of secretary and such other duties as from time to time may be assigned to him by the president or by the Board of Trustees.

SECTION 9. Assistant Treasurers and Assistant Secretaries.

If required by the Board of Trustees, the assistant treasurers shall give bonds for the faithful discharge of their duties in such sums and with such sureties as the Board of Trustees shall determine. The assistant treasurers and assistant secretaries, in general, shall perform such duties as shall be assigned to them by the treasurer or the secretary or by the president or the Board of Trustees.

SECTION 10. The Board of Trustees shall elect a chairman who shall preside at all meetings of the Board of Trustees.

SECTION 11. The Board of Trustees shall elect a vice chairman who shall preside in the absence of the chairman.

ARTICLE V

COMMITTEES

SECTION 1. Committees of Trustees.

The Board of Trustees, by resolution adopted by a majority of the trustees in office, may designate one or more committees, each of which shall consist of two or more trustees, which committees, to the extent provided in said resolution, shall have and exercise the authority of the Board of Trustees in the management of the corporation; but the designation of such committees and the delegation thereto of authority shall not operate to relieve the Board of Trustees, or any individual trustee, of any responsibility imposed upon him by law.

SECTION 2. Executive Committee.

The Board of Trustees at its annual meeting in October shall elect from its own number an Executive Committee of not less than three nor more than eleven members of which the chairman of the Board and the president of the corporation shall always be members. The Executive Committee shall meet at the call of the chairman of the Board or of the president of the Corporation to prepare agenda and recommendations for the Board, to advise the president, to approve the appointment by the chairman of the Board of a nominating committee prior to the annual meeting, and otherwise to expedite the work of the Board of Trustees. The Executive Committee shall have full power to approve leases, contracts and other instruments relating to the use of the real estate of the corporation and to authorize and direct the officers of the Corporation to execute and deliver such leases, contracts, and other instruments so approved by the Executive Committee; provided, however, that the Executive Committee shall not have the power to mortgage, buy, sell, or convey real estate on behalf of the corporation. Actions taken by the Executive Committee, acting as the interim Board, shall in all circumstances be subject to review, modification or reversal by the Board, except to the extent such action is by its nature irrevocable and was taken in reliance upon a direction or a resolution of the Executive Committee prior to a review by the full Board of Trustees.

SECTION 3. Other Committees.

Other committees not having and exercising the authority of the Board of Trustees in the management of the corporation may be designated by a resolution adopted by a majority of the trustees present in a meeting at which a quorum is present. Except as otherwise provided in such resolution, the president of the corporation shall appoint the members thereof. Any member thereof may be removed by the person or persons authorized to appoint such member whenever in their judgment the best interests of the corporation shall be served by such removal.

SECTION 4. Term of Office.

Each member of a committee shall continue as such until the next annual meeting of the corporation and until his successor is appointed, unless the committee shall be sooner terminated, or unless such member be removed from such committee, or unless such member shall cease to qualify as a member thereof.

SECTION 5. Chairman.

One member of each committee shall be appointed chairman.

SECTION 6. Vacancies.

Vacancies in the membership of any committee may be filled by appointments made in the same manner as provided in the case of the original appointments.

SECTION 7. Quorum.

Unless otherwise provided in the resolution of the Board of Trustees designating a committee, a majority of the whole committee shall constitute a quorum and the act of a majority of the members present at a meeting at which a quorum is present shall be the act of the committee.

SECTION 8. Rules.

Each committee may adopt rules for its own government not inconsistent with these bylaws or with rules adopted by the Board of Trustees.

ARTICLE VI

CONTRACTS, CHECKS, DEPOSITS, AND FUNDS

SECTION 1. Contracts.

The Board of Trustees may authorize any officer or officers, agent or agents of the corporation, in addition to the officers so authorized by these bylaws, to enter into any contract or execute and deliver any instrument in the name of and on behalf of the corporation and such authority may be general or confined to specific instance. The Executive Committee may authorize any officer or officers of the corporation to enter into any lease or contract relating to the use of the real estate of the corporation and to execute and deliver any such lease, contract, or other instrument for and in the name of the corporation, provided, however, that such authority shall not be delegated generally but shall be specifically delegated in such instance and that no authority is hereby given to mortgage, buy, sell or convey real estate.

SECTION 2. Checks, Drafts, Etc.

All checks, drafts or other orders for the payment of money, notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued in the name of the corporation, shall be signed by such officer or officers, agent or agents, of the corporation and in such manner as shall from time to time be determined by resolution of the Board of Trustees. In the absence of such determination by the Board of Trustees, such instruments shall be signed by any two of the following officers: president, secretary, treasurer, and a member of the Board of Trustees to be designated by resolution.

SECTION 3. Deposits.

All funds of the corporation shall be deposited from time to time to the credit of the corporation in such banks, trust companies, or other depositaries as the Board of Trustees may select.

SECTION 4. Gifts.

The Board of Trustees may accept on behalf of the corporation any contribution, gift, bequest, or devise for the general purposes or for any special purpose of the corporation.

ARTICLE VII

ADVISORS

The Board of Trustees shall elect a number of persons who shall be called Advisors of Roosevelt University. The Advisors shall have no legislative powers, but shall advise the Board of Trustees and the officers of the University upon questions of general policy. The Advisors shall meet upon invitation of the Board of Trustees. Advisors may meet with one or more of the committees of the Board.

ARTICLE VIII

BOOKS AND RECORDS

The corporation shall keep correct and complete books and records of account and shall also keep minutes of the proceedings of its Board of Trustees and committees having any of the authority of the Board of Trustees. All books and records of the corporation may be inspected by any trustee or officer for any proper purpose at any reasonable time.

ARTICLE IX

FISCAL YEAR

The fiscal year of the corporation shall begin on the first day of September and end on the last day of August in the following year.

ARTICLE X

SEAL

The Board of Trustees shall provide a corporate seal which shall be in the form of a circle and shall have inscribed thereon the name of the corporation and the words "Corporate Seal, Illinois."

ARTICLE XI

WAIVER OF NOTICE

Whenever any notice whatever is required to be given under the provisions of the General Not For Profit Corporation Act of Illinois, or under the provisions of the articles of the incorporation or the bylaws of the corporation, a waiver thereof in writing signed by the person or persons entitled to such notice, whether before or after the time stated therein, shall be deemed equivalent to the giving of such notice.

ARTICLE XII

AMENDMENTS TO BYLAWS

These bylaws may be altered, amended, or repealed and new bylaws may be adopted by a majority of the trustees present at any regular meeting or at any special meeting, provided that at least two days notice is given of intention to alter, amend, or repeal, or to adopt new bylaws at such meeting.

ARTICLE XIII

ADVISORY OPINIONS

Upon the written request of two or more trustees, any question with reference to the organization, business, or policies of the corporation shall be referred to the University Senate or to the Executive Committee of the University Senate for an advisory opinion.

ARTICLE XIV

FACULTY AND STUDENT GOVERNMENT

SECTION 1. The Faculty of Roosevelt University shall have the right, by majority rule, to adopt and amend a constitution and various other regulations for its own government and to enforce such rules, provided they are consistent with the bylaws of the Board of Trustees and the articles of incorporation, and provided they do not violate the legal rights of employees of the University, and provided a copy of such constitution, regulations, and amendments is presented to the Board of Trustees not more than thirty days after enactment, and is approved by the Board of Trustees within ninety days after presentation.

SECTION 2. The Faculty may by its constitution make reasonable requirements for the confirmation of appointments to the deanships and for consultation in the appointment and dismissal of other officers of administration and instruction, except in the appointment of the president.

SECTION 3. A grievance may be referred to the Board of Trustees, if reasonable efforts over a period of three months have failed to settle the grievance. The Board of Trustees reserves the right to determine it will hear the matter.

SECTION 4. The students of Roosevelt University may, through their own properly elected representatives, adopt and amend a constitution and various other regulations for their own government, provided such rules are consistent with the bylaws of the Board of Trustees and the articles of incorporation and the regulations of the University, and provided a copy of such constitution, regulations, and amendments is presented to the president not more than thirty days after enactment. The president shall determine whether the student body has been adequately represented in the formulation of such rules and whether such rules are consistent with the bylaws of the Board of Trustees, the articles of incorporation, and the regulations of the University.

APPENDIX B

The Mission of Roosevelt University

The Mission of Roosevelt University

Roosevelt University is a private, urban, non-sectarian institution of higher learning committed to the fundamental values and purposes of higher education in America. These purposes include: 1) conserving and transmitting knowledge, 2) cultivating an appreciation of learning, 3) performing a critical appraisal of traditional values, 4) advancing the frontiers of knowledge, and 5) providing service to the community. Roosevelt University is committed to academic freedom for its members as a right and responsibility in teaching, research, and in learning. It is committed to the individual teacher and to the individual learner, his personal and intellectual growth and self-fulfillment. In pursuing these goals, the University strives to maintain a high level of excellence and to remain responsive to the demands of today and the challenges of tomorrow.

Founded in 1945 as Roosevelt College, the University, then as now, provided equality of educational opportunity, regardless of racial or social differences. Because full implementation of the concept of equal opportunity for all was then revolutionary in American higher education, the University was able to attract men and women from an unusually diverse group of ethnic minorities who formed a faculty of exceptional quality. Believing in the worth and potentialities of men and women, whatever their background, the faculty of Roosevelt University have concerned themselves with overcoming the divisive effects of differences in racial and cultural heritage and socio-economic background which have permeated the American social fabric. During the past thirty years, the University has provided its members, and the wider community, opportunities to better understand other cultures in order to foster an appreciation of these cultures and their interdependence, and reduce the fear and suspicion which often distort the relations of peoples of different nationalities and races.

One of the distinctive characteristics of Roosevelt University has been and continues to be the heterogeneity of its students: in race and ethnic origin, income, ability and achievement level, age and professional development. This heterogeneity, which has been a strength for America, is a strength of the University.

Roosevelt University seeks to educate each student to be a thinking, evaluating, problem-solving, and appreciative human being by teaching reasoned expression and such arts of inquiry as perceptive observation, analysis and synthesis, and conceptualization. The effective teaching and learning of these arts must include their application to the fundamental questions of humankind as well as to the solution of current social problems. Believing that these arts are learned within many subject fields, Roosevelt University has developed a broad general education curriculum and continues to explore new ways to encourage its students to focus on the goal of learning.

Roosevelt University's unique experience, stemming from its idealistic founding and its democratic governance, gives it the courage and imagination to pursue in today's rapidly changing world dual educational goals: maintaining the traditional values of higher education and pioneering for contemporary objectives. Roosevelt University believes that effectiveness in teaching, excellence in scholarship, and imagination in research must be balanced by social responsibility, concern for the dignity of people, and relevance to contemporary issues and values.

The University's mission is determined in part by its desire to contribute to the solution of certain social problems and to respond to certain social challenges. Some of the social phenomena which influence the University's ordering of educational priorities include: 1) acceleration of the trend towards universal post-secondary education; 2) unwillingness of people to live with frustrated socio-political and intellectual aspirations; 3) changes in occupational patterns; 4) a continuing movement of population to metropolitan areas; 5) increase in the leisure time of working adults; and 6) earlier retirements.

The acceleration of the trend toward universal post-secondary education is related to the creation of avenues for upward mobility for all people, to the removal of the barriers of race-prejudice and of economic deprivation, and to the availability of opportunities for higher education for people of all ages and backgrounds. Providing these opportunities has been an especially important part of the Roosevelt University mission since its founding. By maintaining relatively low costs and by providing scholarship aid and other financial assistance, Roosevelt University has enabled students from the inner city to pursue higher education of a quality which might not otherwise have been available to them. By maintaining a climate in which all persons are accepted and valued, the University encourages students who begin an education to continue. By treating students as adults and by recognizing the special problems of adults, the University has been able to serve people of all ages.

A second important aspect of the University's mission is to provide opportunities for students at all levels to resume an interrupted education. Because Roosevelt University has maintained complete equality of day and evening programs, students may complete the work for their degrees either part-time or full-time, during the day or evening, and at times convenient to them.

A third aspect of the University's mission is the service to the community which it performs by enabling individuals to prepare themselves for new careers. In a society which is rapidly changing and where automation is playing an increasingly important part, a new career often provides an opportunity for continued personal growth. The University's central location in downtown

Chicago, in the heart of the principal business district, in the midst of the city's major cultural facilities, and at its transportation crossroads provides both easy access for people throughout the metropolitan area who wish to further their education and exceptional opportunities for learning.

Since 1945, through research, action-oriented programs, and curricular developments, Roosevelt University has contributed to an understanding of many of the social problems plaguing the community. The University serves its urban community by providing a high quality education for: administrators, counselors, and teachers: public service career personnel; business, industrial, civic and labor leaders; and other professionals in the arts, sciences, and technology. Many of these individuals already hold positions of responsibility when they become students.

Through the musical programs and professional training provided by its Chicago Musical College and through its public programs in art, literature and drama, Roosevelt University has become a major cultural center serving individuals who work in or travel to the city's center as well as those who live in the new residential community growing within the University's neighborhood. The University provides both classroom and extra-curricular opportunities for the creative use of leisure time. The University's Auditorium Theatre offers to its students, the community at large, and to pupils from the city's schools, opera, ballet, symphonic and theatrical performances.

In these ways, Roosevelt University fulfills its commitment to the traditional values of higher education, contributes to the solution of contemporary urban problems, and meets the educational, social and cultural needs of its diverse student body.

Approved: March 6, 1975
The Roosevelt University Board of Trustees
Bd. of Tr. Manual, Sec. E

APPENDIX C

The Student Code of Conduct and the Judicial Review Board Composition and Procedure

THE ROOSEVELT UNIVERSITY STANDARD OF CONDUCT

A student enrolling in the University assumes an obligation to conduct himself in a manner compatible with the University's function as an educational institution. Misconduct for which students are subject to discipline falls into the following categories:

1. Dishonesty, such as cheating, plagiarism, or knowingly furnishing false information to the University;

2. Forgery, alteration, or misuse of University documents, records, or identification;

3. Obstruction or disruption of teaching, research, administration, disciplinary procedures, or other university activities, including its public service functions, or of other authorized activities on university premises;

4. Physical abuse of any person on university-owned or controlled property or at university-sponsored or supervised functions, or conduct which threatens or endangers the health or safety of any such person;

5. Theft of or damage to property of the University or of a member of the university community or campus visitor;

6. Unauthorized entry to or use of university facilities;

7. Violation of university policies or of campus regulations, including campus regulations concerning the registration of student organizations, the use of university facilities, or the time, place, and manner of public expression;

8. Violation of rules governing residence in university-owned or controlled property;

9. Failure to comply with directions of university officials acting in the performance of their duties; or

10. Conduct which adversely affects the student's suitability as a member of the academic community.

Bd. of Tr. Manual, Sec. O

Roosevelt University

Judicial Review Board

Composition and Procedure

It is not the purpose or intent of Roosevelt University to engage in discipline against any of its members frivolously, arbitrarily, or in loco parentis.

However, should the educational mission of the University be interfered with by disruptive or disturbing behavior, it is necessary for the University community to discipline this behavior in order to lessen the possibility of its continuance or reoccurence. It is appropriate that in an institution based on reasoned inquiry and unified by democratic principles that all actions, including discipline be undertaken only after an examination of evidence and the exercise of due process. The Code of Conduct and Procedure for Judicial Review attempt to make explicit those activities which disrupt teaching and learning and the steps which will be followed in their sanction. This code and procedure is established to enhance and safeguard the rights of all students to the academic freedoms of open inquiry, rational discussion, non-coercive persuasion, and informed dissent. Nothing therein should be construed to limit these freedoms in any way.

Adopted by the Administrative Council on May 22, 1969

ROOSEVELT UNIVERSITY JUDICIAL REVIEW BOARD COMPOSITION AND PROCEDURE

I. PURPOSE

Any student who is charged with a violation of University regulations has the right to a fair and impartial hearing to determine the validity of those charges. The Judicial Review Board is an appointed University-wide committee of faculty members and students whose function is to guarantee that this right is protected.

JURISDICTION

The Board shall hear cases of appeal arising out of violations of the Roosevelt University Standard of Conduct as set forth herein. Actions imposed by individual members of the faculty for academic reasons do not fall within the scope of these procedures. Appeals of such cases are heard by the Roosevelt University Steward Committee.

II. Composition of the Judicial Review Board

A. Students - Three students, one from each of the colleges* (College of Arts and Sciences, College of Business Administration, Chicago Musical College) shall be appointed to this committee as participants and three as alternates.

B. Faculty - Three members of the faculty, one from each of the colleges (College of Arts and Sciences, College of Business Administration, Chicago Musical College) shall be appointed to this committee as participants and three as alternates.

C. Chairman - A member of the faculty who will sit without vote except in case of tie.

III. Selection Committee

A. Composition - The Selection Committee shall be comprised of the President of the University, the President of the Student Senate and the chairman of the Executive Committee of the University Senate.

B. Function - The Selection Committee shall meet in April of the year preceding the academic year in which the participants are to serve. It shall review the slates as submitted and shall unanimously choose the members and alternates in keeping with the criteria of composition and qualifications as set forth in sections II and IV.

IV. Qualifications and Selection Procedure

A. Students

1. A student who serves on the Judicial Review Board may be an undergraduate or graduate student.

2. If an undergraduate student, he shall be at least a first semester junior.

3. The student shall possess a cumulative average of 0.20 above good standing.

4. The student shall have earned a minimum of thirty (30) semester hours at Roosevelt University of which at least eighteen (18) must have been earned in the preceding calendar year.

*BGS students are eligible to serve as a representative of the college in which they are pursuing their concentration.

5. (a) No student having been on any form of individual probation within one year prior to the time of appointment to the board is eligible to serve on the board.

   (b) No member of the judicial panel shall be eligible to serve if placed on probation while in office.

B. Procedure for selection of students

1. In the spring semester of the year prior to the academic year in which the student is to serve, the Student Senate shall prepare a slate consisting of at least four (4) qualified students from each of the three (3) colleges.

2. Each student who expresses an interest in serving and meets the qualifications shall submit a written endorsement from a tenure member of the faculty of his college to the President of the Student Senate.

3. The Student Senate having prepared the slate of students shall submit this slate with all supporting documents and endorsements to the Selection Committee. The Selection Committee shall select from the slate two students from each of the three (3) colleges to serve on the Judicial Review Board; designating one(1) to serve as participant and one or more as alternates.

C. Selection and Qualification for Faculty Members

1. In the spring semester of the year prior to the academic year in which the faculty is to serve the executive committee of the University Senate shall submit a slate of at least four (4) tenured members of the faculty from each of the three (3) colleges to the Selection Committee. The Selection Committee shall select from this slate two (2) faculty members from each of the three (3) colleges to serve on the Judicial Review Board: designating one to serve as participant and one (1) as alternate.

V. Chairman of the Judicial Review Board Selection and Qualification
The chairman shall be appointed by the President and shall be a member of the tenured faculty. He is to sit without vote except that in the case of a tie vote on any decision of the regular voting members he shall cast his vote to break the deadlock.

Judicial Procedure

Section I. DEAN OF STUDENTS

The Dean of Students or his designee is the primary University officer for the administration of discipline for unacceptable conduct or which involves infraction of University rules and regulations and will initiate disciplinary action in accordance

Section II. PRELIMINARY PROCEDURES

The Dean of Students or his designee shall investigate any reported student misconduct before initiating formal disciplinary procedures and give the student the opportunity to present his personal version of the incident or occurrence. The Dean of Students may discuss, consult and advise with any student whose conduct is called into question, and the student shall attend such consultations as requested by the Dean of Students. The student shall be given a copy of these procedures. The Dean of Students, in making his investigation and disposition, should utilize the Dean's Advisory Committee on Discipline to make recommendations to him which he shall consider in exercising the authority vested in him.

Section III. INFORMAL DISPOSITION

The Dean of Students or his designee after investigation, and with the consent of the student shall have the authority to impose appropriate discipline. Where the disposition proposed by the Dean of Students in the preliminary proceeding is not accepted by the student in writing, the student shall have the right of notice, hearing and formal procedures as herein set forth before the Judicial Review Board. The student shall have 72 hours to accept or reject the proposed informal disposition. A failure of the student to either accept or reject such proposed disposition within the proposed time fixed shall be deemed to be an acceptance, and in such event the proposed disposition shall become final upon expiration of such time. If the student rejects formal disposition, his signed statement shall be forwarded to the Judicial Review Board. The Dean of Students, at his discretion, may refer cases to the Judicial Review Board without first offering informal disposition. In either case, within 24 hours the disciplinary officer shall notify the chairman of the Judicial Review Board that he is to institute the hearing procedure as herein set forth.

Section IV. STATUS OF CASE UNDER JUDICIAL REVIEW OR APPEAL

While an appeal is pending the enforcement of the decision under appeal will be postponed until a decision on the appeal has been made. Students and organizations with appeals pending may continue to function as they normally would. However, the Dean of Students may at any time temporarily suspend or deny readmission to a student from the University pending formal procedure when he finds and believes from information coming to his attention that the presence of a student on campus could seriously disrupt the University or constitute a danger to the health, safety or welfare of the University and its members.

Section V. ACCEPTING THE APPEAL

The panel itself will decide whether or not the case warrants a hearing, and will either accept the appeal and set a hearing date, or dismiss it without a hearing. If the panel is satisfied that neither an important question of student's rights nor a major sanction is involved and that the decision below is arrived at through due process, it may dismiss the case; it may also dismiss the case if the letter of appeal appears frivilous.

Section VI. NOTICE OF HEARING

The Dean of Students shall initiate disciplinary actions by arranging with the chairman of the Judicial Review Board to call a meeting of the Board by and giving written notice by certified mail to the student charged with misconduct which shall set forth the date, time and place of the alledged violation, the conduct to be inquired into, and the date, time and place of hearing before the Judicial Review Board. Notice by certified mail may be addressed to the last address currently on record with the University. Failure by the student to have his current, local address on record with the University shall not be construed to invalidate such notice. The notice shall be given at least five (5) consecutive calendar days prior to the hearing, unless a shorter time be fixed by the chairman for a good cause. Any request for continuance shall be made at least 48 hours prior to the original hearing date in writing to the chairman, who shall have the authority in his discretion to continue the hearing if he determines the request is timely and made for a good cause. The chairman shall notify the Dean of Students and the students of the new date for the hearing. If the student fails to appear at the scheduled time, the committee may hear and determine the matter in his absence.

Section VII. SECRETARY TO THE JUDICIAL REVIEW BOARD

The Director of Student Activities or his designee shall serve as permanent secretary to the Judicial Review Board. It shall be the function of the Director of Student Activities to aid the chairman and the members of the Board in the following areas:

a. Sending notices

b. Making arrangements for room for hearing

c. Arranging for tape recording of hearing

d. Generally aid the chairman in matters necessary to facilitate the procedure and hearings.

Section VIII. APPEAL HEARING

A. General Statement of Procedures - A Student charged with a breech of university rules or regulations or conduct in violation of the Roosevelt University standards of student conduct is entitled to a written notice and a formal hearing unless the matter be disposed of under the rules for informal disposition. The procedures set forth below shall be interpreted and administered to accomplish this objective and provide for a prompt consideration and disposition of student conduct cases. Disciplinary proceedings are not to be construed as judicial trials, but care shall be taken to comply as full as possible with the spirit and intent of the procedural safeguards set forth herein.

B. Conduct of Hearing - The chairman shall preside at the hearing, call the hearing to order, call the roll of the Board in attendance, ascertain the presence or absence of a student charged with misconduct, read the notice of hearing and charges and verify the receipt of notices of charges by the student where in the case where such notice was not received verify the intent by the Dean of Students to so notify the student by certified mail as set forth within the Section VI of the procedure, report any continuances requested or granted, establish the presence of any adviser or counselor of the student, and call to the attention of the student charged and his adviser any special or extraordinary procedures to be employed during the hearing and to permit the student to make suggestions of or objections to any procedures for the Judicial Review Board to consider.

1. Opening Statements:

   a. The Dean of Students shall make opening remarks outlining the general nature of the case and testify to any facts his investigation has revealed.

   b. The student may make a statement to the Board about the charge at this time or at the conclusion of the University's presentation, at his option.

C. Evidence - Formal rules of evidence shall not apply, and hearsay evidence will be admissable. Either the University or the student may produce any evidence which the party submitting believes to be material to the issues involved. Brief objections to evidence may be made by either party, but the evidence will be permitted to be introduced regardless of the objections. However, in arriving at its final decision, the Board will weigh the evidence in light of the objections made and their reasonableness.

1. University Evidence:

    a. University witnesses are to be called and identified or written reports or evidence introduced as appropriate.

    b. The Board may question the witness at any time

    c. The student or with the permission of the committee, his adviser or counselor, may question witnesses or examine evidence at the conclusion of the university's presentation.

2. Student's Evidence:

    a. The student shall have the opportunity to make a statement to the committee about the charge, and may then present further evidence through witnesses or in the form of written memoranda as he desires. The committee may question the student or witnesses at any time. The Dean of Students may question the student or witnesses or examine evidence at the conclusion of the student's presentation.

3. Rebuttal Evidence:

    a. The University or the student may offer any matter in rebuttal of the others presentation.

D. Procedures of the Judicial Review Board

1. The Judicial Review Board may establish procedures as follows:

    a. In cases involving more than one student which arise out of the same transgression or occurrence to hear such cases together, but in that event shall make separate findings and determinations for each student.

    b. To permit a stipulation of facts by the Dean of Students and the student involved.

    c. To question witnesses or other evidence introduced by either the University or the student at the conclusion of their testimony.

    d. To call additional witnesses or require additional investigation.

e. To dismiss any action at any time or permit informal disposition as otherwise provided:

f. To permit or require at any time amendment of the notice of hearing to include new or additional matters which may come to the attention of the Board before final determination of the case; provided, however, that in such event the committee shall grant to the student or Dean of Students such time as the committee may determine reasonable under the circumstances to answer or explain such additional matters.

g. To dismiss any person from the hearing who interfers with or obstructs the hearing or fails to abide by the rulings of the Chairman or the committee on request; and

h. To summarily suspend students from this University who, during the hearing, obstruct or interfere with the course of the hearing or request of the chairman for order.

E. Student Right Upon Hearing

1. A student upon appearing before a Judicial Review Board parsuant to formal notice of charges and disciplinary hearing shall have the right:

a. To be present at the hearing;

b. To have present at the hearing a parent, guardian, teacher, fellow student, or other adviser of his choice. The student shall notify the chairman of the name of the adviser and the relationship to him at least one (1) day before the hearing. If the student requests it in advance, the chairman will ask a member of the faculty to attend as adviser to the student. An adviser may be permitted to make brief statements and, with permission of the committee, to question witnesses on the students' behalf; otherwise the adviser's role will be to consult with the student.

2. Attorney at the Hearing

a. If the student designates an attorney as his adviser, he shall notify the chairman of the Board at least 48 hours before the hearing so that the University may arrange to have legal counsel present. In addition, the attorney should keep the following in mind:

the committee is not a court of law but an educational agency. It does not follow the formal rules of evidence and procedure. Academic decorum requires an attorney to play a different and more limited role than in the court room. Technical objections without substance, or emotional or over aggressive tactics may well work to the disadvantage of the attorney's client.

b. To hear or examine evidence presented to the committee against him;

c. To question the witness present and testifying against him at the hearing;

d. To present evidence by witness or affidavit of any defense the student desires;

e. To make any statement to the committee in mitigation or explanation of his conduct in question that he desires;

f. To be informed in writing by the Judicial Review Board of any discipline imposures; and

g. To appeal to the President of the University as herein provided.

F. General Rules of Decorum

The following rules of decorum shall be adhered to:

1. All requests to address the committee shall be addressed to the chairman.

2. The chairman will rule on all requests and points of order and may consult with the Boards, legal adviser if present prior to any ruling. The chairman's ruling shall be final and all participants shall abide thereby, unless the chairman shall present the question to the Board at the request of a member of the Board, in which event the ruling of the Board by majority vote shall be final.

3. Rules of common courtesy and decency shall be observed at all times.

4. An adviser or counselor may be permitted to address the committee at the discretion of the committee. An adviser may request clarification of a procedural matter or object on the basis of procedure at any time by addressing the chairman after recognition.

G. Record of Hearing

A taped record of the hearing shall be maintained under the control of the chairman. The hearings and records related to them will be kept confidential out of deference of the interest of all students involved. The hearings record shall be maintained and kept at least three (3) years. The notice, exhibits, hearing record and the findings and the determinations of the committee shall become the "record of the case" and shall be filed in the office of the Dean of Students' and for the purpose of appeal be accessible at reasonable times and places to both the University and the student.

H. Decision of the Judicial Review Board

The Judicial Review Board shall by majority vote then make its findings and determination in executive session out of the presence of the Dean of Students and the student charged. Separate findings are to be made (1) as to the conduct of the student and (2) on the discipline, if any, to be imposed. No discipline shall be imposed on the student unless a majority of the committee present is convinced by a prepondrance of the evidence that the student has committed the violation charged and should be disciplined therefore.

I. Opinion Accompanying the Decision

After deliberation, the Judicial Review Board will prepare an opinion including the facts found to be true, university regulations violated, and the sanction imposed. The opinion will be distributed to the membership of the Board, to the student, and to the Dean of Students. Any part of the opinion identifying the student will otherwise be kept confidential. The Board may direct the other portion of the opinion to be made public.

J. Hearing

All hearings shall be closed except that they may be opened if the student specifically requests that the hearing be opened to the University community and if this request is approved by a majority of the members of the Board present. The Judicial Review Board may at any time by majority vote of the members present close an open hearing. The request for an open hearing must be made in writing and submitted to the Board at the same time that the request for review is submitted.

K. Other Procedural Questions

Procedural questions which arise during the hearing not covered by these general rules shall be determined by the chairman, whose ruling shall be final unless the chairman shall present the question to the committee at the request of the member of the committee in which event the ruling of the committee by majority vote shall be final. The Judicial Review Board may at the request of the chairman or a majority of the members present go into closed executive session.

VI. The decision of the Judicial Review Board are final, but they are subject to review by the President. The Dean of Students or the student may appeal the decision of the Judicial Review Board to the President or his designated representative by filing a written request of appeal with the President within five (5) consecutive calendar days after notification of the decision of the Judicial Review Board.

A copy of the request of appeal will contemporaneously be given by the student to the Dean of Students or by the Dean of Students to the student. The appealing party may file a written memorandum for consideration by the President with a notice of appeal, and the President may request a reply to such memorandum by the student or Dean of Students.

The President or his designated representative shall review the full record of the case and the appeal documents and may affirm, change or reverse the decision or remand the case for further proceedings and shall notify the Dean of Students and the student in writing of his decision on the appeal.

APPENDIX D

Roosevelt University Committee List

ROOSEVELT UNIVERSITY

1975-1976
COMMITTEE
LISTS

I. REGULAR ADVISORY COMMITTEES

II. INTERDEPARTMENTAL PROGRAM COMMITTEES

III. COMMITTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

IV. JOINT COMMITTEES ESTABLISHED BY THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

V. REPRESENTATIVES AND OFFICERS OF THE FACULTY

VI. ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEES

VII. JOINT UNION-UNIVERSITY COMMITTEES

CONTENTS

I. REGULAR ADVISORY COMMITTEES 1

A. Admissions 1
B. Alumni-Faculty Liaison 1
C. Arts 1
D. Athletic 2
E. Bookstore 2
F. Commencement 2
G. Computer 2
H. Correspondence Study 3
I. Faculty Research and Professional Improvements 3
J. Government Relations Advisory 3
K. Graduate Scholarship 4
L. International Student 4
M. Labor Education 4
N. Library 4
O. Planning 5
P. Probation and Reinstatement 5
Q. Public Relations 5
R. Registration 5
S. Social Affairs and Welfare 6
T. Student Aid 6
U. Union-University 6
V. Venture Grant

II. INTERDEPARTMENTAL PROGRAM COMMITTEES 7

A. African Studies 7
B. Culture Studies 7
C. Honors 7
D. Literature 202 7
E. Physical Science 7
F. Public Administration 7
G. Social Work 7
H. Statistics 7
I. Urban Studies 8

III. COMMITTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE 8

A. Budget 8
B. Curriculum 8
C. Executive 9
D. University Teacher Education 9

IV. JOINT COMMITTEES ESTABLISHED BY THE UNIVERSITY SENATE 10

A. Student Activities Board
B. Torch Publication Board

V. REPRESENTATIVES AND OFFICERS OF THE FACULTY 10

A. Roosevelt University Senate 10
B. Arts and Sciences Council 13
C. College of Business Administration Council 13
D. College of Continuing Education Council 13
E. College of Education Council 14
F. Chicago Musical College Council 14
G. Graduate Council 14
H. Marshals of the University 14
I. Faculty Representatives to the Board of Trustees 15

VI. ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEES 15

A. Academic Conference 15
B. Administrative Council 16

VII. JOINT UNION-UNIVERSITY COMMITTEES 16

A. Union-University Health and Welfare 16

I. REGULAR ADVISORY COMMITTEES

These committees function throughout the 1975-76 academic year. They operate as groups, each responsible through its chairperson to the President or to whomever is specifically designated. Committee chairpersons are expected to see that reports, when due, are made to the person or group to whom the committee is responsible.

A. ADMISSIONS

Purpose: To advise the President and the Dean of Students on matters which require interpretation of faculty policy regarding admissions, and through the chairperson, to apprise the Senate of conditions which may make necessary a reconsideration of the existing admissions policy of the University.

Personnel: Ch.-Charles Simmons, Elizabeth Balanoff, Judith Burleigh, Felix Ganz, Milton Greenberg, James Hall, Edith Nicholas, Lily Rose, Hugh Sargent, Bernard Silverman, Lawrence Silverman, Sarah Woods

Resource Person: Ralph Meinking
Origin of Appointment: The President

Reporting: To the Academic Conference, Administrative Council or University Senate as appropriate. The work of this committee will ordinarily be summarized by the chairperson in the annual report.

B. ALUMNI-FACULTY LIAISON

Purpose: To cooperate with the Alumni Association in its program of continuing education by helping define, implement and promote the goals of the program.

Personnel: Ch.-Roma Rosen, Jerome Ellis, Vincent Gambino, Ruby Franklin, Lily Rose, Jack Silber

C. ARTS

Purpose: To creat a more attractive aesthetic environment for the students and faculty by means of a program through which the University might acquire appropriate art objects.

Personnel: Ch.-Don Baum, Valerie Carnes, Jack Harris, Dominic Martia, Max Nichols, Marci Enos, Harry Price, one student

D. ATHLETIC

Purpose: To interpret and apply NAIA rules and regulations for University athletic activities.

Personnel: Ch. -Hugh Wales, Jay Curtice, Paul Hanchett, Larry Land, Dominic Martia, Roger Scanlon, Miriam Showalter, Herbert Slutsky
ex-officio: Robert Griggas, Edwin Turner

Origin of Appointment:	The President
Reporting:	To the President

E. BOOKSTORE

Purpose: To discuss matters affecting bookstore operations and to advise the Controller on management of the bookstore.

Personnel: Ch. -Harold Bland, Milton Greenberg, Ferdinand Kolegar, Darrel Monteith, Brandel Works, two students

Origin of Appointment:	The President
Reporting:	To the Controller

F. COMMENCEMENT

Purpose: To advise the President in the formulation of policies and procedures pertaining to the commencement exercises.

Personnel: Ch. -Charles Simmons, Elaine Davis, Alice Dutcher, Dominic Martia, Thomas Naumann, David Steere, Leon Stein, Robert Tucker, Edwin Turner, one student

Origin of Appointment: The President
Reporting: To the President, consultation as necessary, no formal reports

G. COMPUTER

Purpose: To coordinate and set policy with regard to institutional use of computers, to study and advise on research and curricular matters relating to the Computer Center. The committee will be responsible to and report to the Dean of Faculties.

Personnel: Ch. -Milton Greenberg, Harold Bland, Sami Ercan, James Hall, Regina Holloman, Adrian Jones, Ted Mlsna, Max Plager, William Roderick, H. Chang Shih, Leon Youssef

Origin of Appointment:	The President
Reporting:	To the President

H. CORRESPONDENCE STUDY

Purpose To advise the appropriate deans and the President as to the courses offered through correspondence.

Personnel: Ch.-James Hall, John Freels, Morris Goran, Arthur Grant, Herbert Slutsky, David Steere, Bismarck Williams, Gary Wolfe

Origin of Appointment:	The President
Reporting:	To the Dean of Faculties

I. FACULTY RESEARCH AND PROFESSIONAL IMPROVEMENTS

Purpose: To advise faculty members regarding the preparation of research proposals for Roosevelt University Fellowships and professional improvement leaves. To advise the administration on the support and development of both faculty research and professional improvement leaves and to screen applicants.

Personnel: Ch.-Milton Greenberg, Herbert Coverdale, Alex DeGrand, Gabriel Edwin, Anne Freedman, Felix Ganz, Henrietta Schwartz, Bernard Silverman, Gary Wolfe

Origin of Appointment: The President

Reporting: A summary of this committee's activities will ordinarily be included in the annual report of the Dean of Faculties to the President

J. GOVERNMENT RELATIONS ADVISORY

Purpose: To disseminate information about government support programs; to review the University's involvement with local, state and federal programs; to recommend ways in which the University can take full advantage of opportunities available to it for the support of activities and projects that are within the institution's scope and mission; to encourage and assist in the preparation and submission of high quality proposals for the support of faculty research and other projects.

Personnel: Ch.-Daniel Perlman, Ralph Carnes, Edwin Gross, James Hall, Robert Koff, Robert Lombardo, Roma Rosen, H. Chang Shih, Sarah Woods

Origin of Appointment:	The President
Reporting:	To the President

K. GRADUATE SCHOLARSHIP

Purpose: To determine the allocation of scholarship funds to qualified graduate students. These awards are limited to students taking a program of nine semester hours or more in a regular semester or th[illegible] more hours in a summer session.

Personnel: Ch. -Fred Turner: Ralph Carnes, Felix Ganz, Milton Greenberg, James Hall, Edwin Gross, Robert Koff, Roma Rosen; Joseph Ament, Vincent Gambino, Robert Ivy, Robert McNeill, George Wilson

L. INTERNATIONAL STUDENT

Purpose: To provide means of integrating foreign students into the life of the University community and of Chicago by means of such arrangements as social activities, orientation programs, tours, exhibits, contacts with religious, social and civic groups.

Personnel: Ch. -Philip Boyd Stevens, Jules Corbett, Elaine Davis, Ann Gier, Regina Holloman, Adrian Jones, Larry Lund, Dominic Martia, Edith Nicholas, Roma Rosen, Bismarck Williams, Sarah Woods, two students

Origin of Appointment:	The President
Reporting:	To the Dean of Students

M. LABOR EDUCATION

Purpose: To advise the Dean of Faculties and the President on matters pertaining to the policies of the Labor Education Division, including the relation of the division to the colleges of the University.

Personnel: Ch. -Duane Beeler, Elizabeth Balanoff, James Hall, Regina Holloman, Quin McLoughlin, Frances Oxley, Robert Snyder, Robert Stevens

N. LIBRARY

Purpose: To consider suggestions and proposals for improvement of the library and audio-visual services and to make recommendations with respect to long-term plans for the development and use of the library and audio-visual services.

Personnel: Ch. -Adrian Jones, Glenn Eigenbrodt, Bruce Kraig, Robert Seymour, Robert Snyder, Gladys Turner, Frank Untermyer, Carol Williams, Nathan Yagol; students-Al Florian, Margeruite Freese

O. PLANNING

Purpose: To develop plans for the future of the University based on academic policy considerations; to review plans proposed by other groups within the University: to make recommendations to the Senate and other policy making bodies. The committee is constituted as follows: four administrators appointed yearly by the President, four members from the faculty at large, elected by the Senate for two year overlapping terms, and one student elected yearly by the Student Senate.

Personnel: Ch. -Milton Greenberg, Ralph Carnes, Alex DeGrand, Jerome Ellis, Regina Holloman, Adrian Jones, Harry Nelson, Daniel Perlman
ex officio: Rolf Weil

Origin of Appointment: The Senate, January 17, 1973

P. PROBATION AND REINSTATEMENT

Purpose: To interpret and apply the probation and reinstatement rules; to decide individual cases of reinstatement and special problem cases of probation and dismissal; to recommend any changes in the system to the appropriate policymaking body.

Personnel: Ch. -Lawrence Silverman, Marie Kisiel, Charles Simmons, John Freels, Bernard Silverman Resource Persons: Mary Ellen Kevlin, Lily Rose

Origin of Appointment: The President
Reporting: To the President

Q. PUBLIC RELATIONS

Purpose: To anticipate public relations problems, engage in public relations planning and advise the administration in the area of public relations for the University.

Personnel: Ch. -Wendell Arnold, Robert Dameron, Arthur Eckberg, Felix Ganz, Milton Greenberg, Dominic Martia, Annette Nussbaum, Daniel Perlman, Lawrence Silverman, Robert Snyder, Rolf Weil, Walter Neisser

R. REGISTRATION

Purpose: To advise the Dean of Students on matters pertaining to the administration of registration.

Personnel: Ch. -Charles Simmons, Jerome Ellis, Roberta Fireman, Richard Fritz, Vincent Gambino, James Hall, LaVerne O'Donnell, Susan DeRonne, Lily Rose, William Specht, David Steere

Origin of appointment: The President Reporting: To the Dean of Faculties

S. SOCIAL AFFAIRS AND WELFARE

Purpose: To promote and prepare social activities of the faculty, including teas and other events that will enable the faculty members to meet distinguished visitors and guests, and to make the faculty better acquainted with one another through appropriate social events.

Personnel: Ch. -Laurel Tryforos, Alex DeGrand, Florence Medow

Origin of Appointment:	The President
Reporting:	To the President

T. STUDENT AID

Purpose: To establish general policies for student financial aid; to determine the allocation of scholarship funds; to conduct an examination for competitive scholarships; to determine policies for the award of scholarships, grants-in-aid, student loans, and student employment by the University; to make recommendations to the President on tuition grant applicants from foreign lands.

Personnel: Ch. -Lawrence Silverman, Ralph Carnes, Jay Curtice, Arthur Eckberg, Robert Franklin, Felix Ganz, Peter Kountz, Roma Rosen, Bismarck Williams, Edwin Turner

Origin of Appointment:	The President
Resource Person:	Mary Ellen Kevlin

Reporting: To the President as necessary. A general summary report will be included in the annual report of the Director of Student Aid, to be submitted to the President by the Dean of Students.

U. UNION-UNIVERSITY

Purpose: To meet periodically, in accordance with the union-university contract, with six members of the Roosevelt University local of the Office and Professional Employees International Union (O. P. E. I. U.) in order to discuss questions of mutual concern to the university and its office employees.

Personnel: Ch. -Harold Bland, Arthur Eckberg, Robert Franklin, Daniel Perlman, Frances Oxley Union - Carrie Brown, Carolyn Combs, Robin Crescenzi, Michael Cobb, Creola Rigsby, Jabulani Kulubally

Origin of Appointment:	The President

V. VENTURE GRANT

Purpose: To accept, study and select proposals to be funded with Venture Grant money.

Personnel: Ch. -Milton Greenberg, Ralph Carnes, Herbert Coverdale, Alex DeGrand, Ruby Franklin, Adrian Jones, Daniel Perlman, William Roderick

Origin of Appointment:	The President
Reporting:	To the President

INTERDEPARTMENTAL PROGRAM COMMITTEES

Purpose: To advise the appropriate persons or bodies on the operation of existing inter-departmental academic programs; to explore new possibilities for inter-departmental cooperation; and, when appropriate, to act as a department in making curricular recommendations.

Origin of Appointment:	The President

A. AFRICAN STUDIES: Ch. -Sarah Woods, Dietrich Reitzes, Elizabeth Balanoff, Loretta Butler, Robert Hollins, Frank Untermyer, Clifton Washington, James Stevenson

B. CULTURE STUDIES: Ch. -Alice Zimring, Lorin Contescu, Sami Ercan, John Freels, Regina Holloman, Leon Stein, Farhang Zabeeh

C. HONORS: Ch. -William Specht, Donald Bernstein, Jerome Fleming, Dennis Rohatyn, Lawrence Silverman, Fred Turner, Carol Williams, George Wilson

D. LITERATURE 202: Ch. -Helena Szepe, Erica Aronson, Valerie Carnes, John Foster, Jerome Landfield, Alice Zimring

E. PHYSICAL SCIENCE: Ch. -Morris Goran, Jay Curtice, Donna Gorecki, William Roderick, Herbert Slutsky

F. PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION: Ch. -Robert McNeill, John Freels, Herbert Coverdale, David Kleinerman, Robert Seymour, Robert Stevens, Paul Zimmerer, ex officio: Ralph Carnes, Milton Greenberg, Roma Rosen, John Rogers

G. SOCIAL WORK: Ch. -Marjorie Mayo, Arthur Eckberg, Jerome Fleming, Robert Franklin, Sue Lofton, Dietrich Reitzes, James Stevenson, Sarah Woods

H. STATISTICS: Ch. - Jack Silber, Benjamin Burack, Sami Ercan, Jerome Fleming, Stuart Meshboum, Ted Misna, Frances Oxley, Leon Youssef

I. URBAN STUDIES: Ch.-Dietrich Reitzes, John Freels, Marjorie Mayo, Robert McNeill, Richard Rubenstein, Herbert Slutsky

COMMITTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

A. BUDGET

Purpose: "The Budget Committee ... has as its purpose the drafting of the University budget and any subsequent amendments thereof and the submission of such budget and amendments through the President to the Board of Trustees for action. The recommendations of the Budget Committee and the President (the latter therein acting in his capacity as an officer of the Board) are to accompany each such submission." Board of Trustees minutes 4-17-52

Personnel: "The Budget Committee is to consist of six members ... three administrative members (the President, the Dean of Faculties, and the Controller) and three elected faculty members for staggered two year terms. (Two of the faculty members are to be elected every even-numbered year, one every odd-numbered year)."

Administrators:	Rolf Weil, Milton Greenberg, Harold Bland
Faculty:	H. Chang Shih - '74-'76, Jack Silber '74-'76, Edward Gordon '75-'77

Origin of Appointment: The Board of Trustees, 10-17-67, for administrative members, the University Senate for faculty members .. not later than November 30 of each year for two year terms

Reporting: To the Board of Trustees, through the President

B. CURRICULUM

Purpose: "The Curriculum Committee may initiate and shall study and recommend to the Senate all changes pertaining to curricula which are not within the jurisdiction of any college council, and shall review any curriculum actions of any college council which may affect the interests of another college, and shall submit recommendations thereon to the Senate for final decision." Faculty Constitution, Article III, Section 3, Subsection 2, Clause 3

Personnel: The President, the Deans, the Registrar, all chairmen of departments who are voting members of the faculty and one student elected by the Student Senate. Ch. -Herbert Slutsky

Origin of Appointment: The Faculty Constitution, Article III, Section 3, Subsection 2, Clause 1

Reporting: To the Senate. Action by the Senate is necessary in the following cases: When action of the Curriculum Committee is not unanimous; the changing of required courses; when actions of a college affect the interests of another college.

C. EXECUTIVE

Purpose: A) To investigate all questions referred to it by the University Senate, and after due deliberation to make appropriate recommendations. B) To make decisions for the University Senate on routine questions during the intervals between University Senate meetings, and to decide questions of general policy in emergencies. All decisions shall subsequently be referred to the University Senate. C) To advise the President on administrative questions which have academic implications. D) To review before final severance is effected in cases of dismissal involving tenured members of the teaching staff.

Personnel: Ch. -Oscar Goodman, Ralph Carnes, Jerome Fleming, Doris Harmon, Phyllis Hill, Max Plager, Alice Zimring; Seymour Patinkin (Chairman of Senate, ex officio without vote); Rolf Weil, President, Milton Greenberg, Dean of Faculties, ex officio with votes

Origin of Appointment: The Faculty Constitution, Article III, Section 3, Subsection 1, Clause 2 . . the Senate annually

Reporting: As provided in the Faculty Constitution

D. UNIVERSITY TEACHER EDUCATION

Purpose: To coordinate the training of teachers among all units of the University; To articulate various departmental functions as they relate to the training of teachers; To approve all new programs in teacher education.

Personnel: the Dean of Faculties, the deans of the colleges, the Dean of the Graduate Division, the Associate Dean of Admissions, one faculty member from the Business College, three from the College of Arts and Sciences (one each from natural sciences, social sciences and humanities), one member from the Chicago Musical College, two members from the College of Education

Milton Greenberg, Ralph Carnes, Felix Ganz, Edwin Gross, James Hall, Robert Koff, Roma Rosen, Charles Simmons; Sheldon Wagner, H. Chang Shih, Bernard Silverman, Alice Zimring, Harold Kupper, Loretta Butler, Miram Showalter

Origin of Appointment: Faculty Constitution, Article III, Section 3, Subsection 3, Clause 2 Reporting: To the University Senate

IV. JOINT COMMITTEES ESTABLISHED BY THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

A. STUDENT ACTIVITIES BOARD

Purpose: To develop policies for and regulate the conduct of student affairs within the University under authority delegated by the University Senate.

Personnel: Faculty - Loretta Butler Eileen Flanders, Daniel Headrick, Robert Hollins, Regina Holloman, Bruce Kraig; Students - Linda Hunter, Ben Oluwole, Beautina Gordon, Walid Alabbasi, Andrew Burrows, Farshid Djahani

B. TORCH PUBLICATION BOARD

Purpose: To select the editor and business manager of the Torch; to approve the budget, and establish policies for the conduct of the Torch under authority delegated by the University Senate.

Personnel: Faculty -

Origin of Appointment: The Student Activities Board authorized by the Senate, Spring, 1966 Reporting: To the University Senate

V. REPRESENTATIVES AND OFFICERS OF THE FACULTY

A. ROOSEVELT UNIVERSITY SENATE

Officers	Chairman	Seymour Patinkin
	Vice Chairman	Lawrence Silverman
	Secretary	Max Plager

Ex Officio:	President	Rolf A. Weil
	Director of Development	Wendell Arnold
	Treasurer	Harold Bland
	Dean of Faculties	Milton Greenberg
	Dean of Students	Lawrence Silverman
	Dean, College of Arts and Sciences	Ralph Carnes
	Dean, Walter E. Heller College	Edwin Gross
	Dean, Chicago Musical College	Felix Ganz
	Dean, College of Education	Robert Koff
	Dean, College of Continuing Education	James Hall
	Dean, Graduate Division	Roma Rosen
	Director, Labor Education Division	Duane Beeler
	Director of Libraries	Adrian Jones
	Associate Dean of Admissions	Charles Simmons
Faculty:	College of Arts and Sciences	
	Art	Jack Harris
	Biology	Jules Corbett
		Donna Gorecki
		Harry Nelson
	Chemistry	Jay Curtice
		Seymour Patinkin
		Sarah Woods
	Economics	Frances Oxley
		Robert Stevens
	English	Ann Gier
		Jack Foster
		Burton Kendle
		Jerome Landfield
		Yolanda Lyon
	Geography	James Zentifis
	History	Alexander DeGrand
		Paul Johnson
		David Miller
	Languages	Terry Taylor
		Alice Zimring
	Mathematics	Max Plager
		Jack Silber
	Philosophy	David Mouton
		Farhang Zabeeh
	Physics	Edward Piotrowski
		H. Chang Shih
	Political Science	Jack Freels
		Richard Rubenstein

Psychology	Benjamin Burack
	Jerome Fleming
	Sonja Saxonberg
Public Administration	Robert McNeil
Sociology-Anthropology	Regina Holloman
	Kubet Luchterhand
	Dietrich Reitzes
Unorganized	Morris Goran
	Edwin Turner

Walter E. Heller College of Business Administration

Accounting	Erlinda Clark
	Samuel Fox
	Leon Youssef
Finance	Oscar Goodman
	Paul Hanchett
Management & Personnel	Charles Noty
	Sheldon Wagner
Marketing	Robert Seymour
	Edward Gordon
	Robert Snyder
Unorganized	Theodore Maheras

College of Education	Vincent Gambino
	Doris Harmon
	Martin Jason
	Rosemarie Schultz
	Bernard Sherman

College of Continuing Education	Marie Kisiel
	Peter Kountz
	William Roderick
	Carol Williams
	Gary Wolfe

Chicago Musical College

Music Education	Harold Kupper
	David Larson
Organ	Robert Reuter
Piano	Goldie Golub
	Phyllis Hill
String Instruments	Pamela Kimmel
	Karl Fruh
Theory and Composition	Robert Conant
	Ralph Dodds
Voice	Alice Dutcher
Wind and Percussion	Carl Sonik

Library	Karen Miller
Administrative Associate	Mary Catherine LaMothe
Administrative	Robert Dameron
Student	Ben Oluwole Beautyna Gordon

B. ARTS AND SCIENCES COUNCIL

Membership: President, Dean of Faculties, Registrar regular voting teachers in Arts and Sciences, the Dean of the College and representatives of the Library

Chairperson	John Currano
Vice Chairperson	Dennis Rohatyn
Secretary	Caryl Smith

Executive Committee: Jerome Fleming, John Foster, Robert Ivy, Edward Piotrowski, Jack Silber ,Leon Stein, Fahrang Zabeeh

C. COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION COUNCIL

Membership: All full-time Business Administration faculty, the Dean, a representative from the Library and the President

Chairperson	Theodore Maheras
Secretary	Donald Bernstein

Executive Committee: Jerome Ellis, Herbert Coverdale, Oscar Goodman Robert Seymour, Robert Tucker

D. COLLEGE OF CONTINUING EDUCATION COUNCIL

Membership: All full-time faculty of the college and two BGS students elected according to the procedure established by the council; twelve members elected by the other college councils to include two from the Business Administration College, two from the Chicago Musical College, six from the College of Arts and Sciences (two from Natural Sciences, Social Sciences and Humanities); two from the College of Education; the President, the Dean of Faculties, the Dean of each college, the Director of Labor Education and the Registrar are ex-officio.

Non-CCE members: Jay Curtice, Doris Harmon, Bruce Kraig, Robert Ivy, William Specht, Dietrich Reitzes, David Miller, Lane Emery, Sharon Rogers Sheldon Wagner, Erlinda Clark

Chairperson	Mary O'Neill
Vice Chairperson	Clifford Reims
Secretary	Pamela Kimmel

Executive Committee: Ch.-Saul Dorfman, Robert Conant, Goldie Golub, George Wilson, Debbra Wood; Donald Draganski-Library

E. COLLEGE OF EDUCATION COUNCIL

Membership: President, Dean of Faculties, Registrar, all College of Education faculty granted voting rights under the Roosevelt University constitution.

Chairperson	Ruby Franklin
Vice Chairperson	Doris Harmon
Secretary	William Dashiell

Executive Committee: Ch. -Miriam Showalter, Judith Burleigh, Ruby Franklin, Vincent Gambino, Abraham Simon, Yuri Tajima; Library - Frances Kozuch

F. CHICAGO MUSICAL COLLEGE COUNCIL

Membership: President Dean of Faculties, Registrar, regular voting members of the College of Music and the Dean of the College.

Chairperson	Mary O'Neill
Vice Chairperson	Clifford Reims
Secretary	Pamela Kimmel

Executive Committee: Ch. -Saul Dorfman, Robert Conant, Goldie Golub, George Wilson, Debbra Wood; Library - Donald Draganski

G. GRADUATE COUNCIL

Membership: One member of each department offering graduate work, the President, the Dean of Faculties, the Dean of the Graduate Division, the Dean of each college, voting members ; the Associate Dean of Admissions and the Registrar are non-voting members.

Department	Representative	Alternate
Accounting	Joseph Ament	David Kleinerman
Biology	Laura Bradford	Donna Gorecki
Business Administration	Bismarck Williams	Joseph Ament
Chemistry	Fred Turner	Jay Curtice
Continuing Education	Carol Williams	Gary Wolfe
Economics	Arthur Grant	Frank Goldberg
Education	Vincent Gambino	Curtis Melnick
English	Douglas Stenerson	Burton Kendle

G. Graduate Council - cont.

Department	Representative	Alternate
History	Alex DeGrand	Paul Johnson
Language/Comparative Lit	Robert Ivy	Helena Szepe
Marketing Communications	Edward Gordon	Robert Snyder
Mathematics	John Currano	Harold Schneider
Music	Robert McDowell George Wilson	Robert Reuter
Philosophy	Farhang Zabeeh	Dennis Temple
Physics	Arthur Harris	Edward Piotrowski
Political Science	Anne Freedman	John Freels
Psychology	Donohue Tremaine	Jerome Fleming
Public Administration	Robert McNeill	Paul Zimmerer
Sociology	Ferdinand Kolegar	Robert Roberts
Urban Studies	Dietrich Reitzes	Thomas Hazen
Library	Avery Williams	Gladys Leaman

H. MARSHALS OF THE UNIVERSITY

Edwin Turner	Marshal	Leon Stein	Assist. Marshal
Harry Nelson	Associate Marshal	Robert Tucker	" "
Jerome Ellis	Assistant Marshal	Sheldon Wagner	" "

I. FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES TO THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Ruby Franklin	'74-'77	John Foster	'75-'78
David Miller	'74-'77	Seymour Patinkin	'73-'76
Oscar Goodman	'75-'78	Jack Silber	'73-'76
George Wilson	'73-'76		

VI. ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEES

A. ACADEMIC CONFERENCE

Purpose: Advises the President and the senior academic officers on the administrative implications of academic matters.

Membership: The Dean of Faculties, the deans of the colleges, the Director of the Labor Education Division, the Dean of the Graduate Division, the Director of Libraries and the President or his delegate.

Personnel: Ch. -Milton Greenberg, Ralph Carnes, Felix Ganz, Edwin Gross, James Hall, Robert Koff, Duane Beeler, Roma Rose, Adrian Jones, Rolf Weil

B. ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL

Purpose: To advise the President on the establishment of administrative policies for the University.

Personnel: Ch. -Rolf Weil, Wendell Arnold, Duane Beeler, Harold Bland, Ralph Carnes, Felix Ganz, Edwin Gross, Milton Greenberg, James Hall, Robert Koff, Dominic Martia, Daniel Perlman, Roma Rosen, Lawrence Silverman

JOINT UNION-UNIVERSITY COMMITTEES

A. UNION-UNIVERSITY HEALTH AND WELFARE

Purpose: To advise the Union-University Committee on the health and welfare needs as outlined in the Union-University contract.

Personnel: Ch. -Harriet Clark, Phyllis Burke, Lois Stewart, Jabulani Kulubally, Gladys Turner, Arthur Barbakoff